

**Docket, Hearing**

---

**From:** jbrookn [jbrookn@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 14, 2012 10:19 AM  
**To:** Docket, Hearing  
**Subject:** CLOSE INDIAN PONT

Dear Ms. Siarnacki and NRC hearing officials;

As you know, the Indian Point Nuclear Plant sits amongst the highest population density of any nuclear plant in this country, with approximately 20,000,000 residents within 50-miles of the plant. New York is the financial capital of this country and much of the world. The property value alone within a 50-mile radius of Indian Point is multiple trillions of dollars, and the vast majority of New York City drinking water flows from reservoirs within 20-miles of Indian Point. Imagine the chaos and imagine the impact on the US economy if Indian Point experienced the unexpected and had a major radiation release in the Hudson Valley. This would dwarf the financial impact of the attack on 9/11/2001. These elements highlight the enormous risks should the low probability, high impact event occur at this aging facility.

Indian Point is also a serious detriment to the health of our river and to its recreational use for fishing and swimming. More than 1 billion dead fish and other organisms, killed by Indian Point's cooling water intakes every year. Indian Point uses more than 2.5 billion gallons of water per day, sucking river life in with the water. Clean water laws require the use of the best available technology to reduce the environmental damage, but Indian Point's owners have refused – for decades – to upgrade to modern technology. The slaughter helps explain why 10 of 13 signature Hudson River species are in decline.

I am well aware that the relicensing regulations are tightly drawn, and contentions filed in opposition to relicensing have been dismissed as out of scope. To disregard the magnitude of risk in scenarios that are certainly not beyond feasibility is an abdication of the primary charge of the NRC – to protect public health and safety. Strictly adhering to regulations that are not all encompassing is similar to the “just following orders” defense used and rejected at the Nuremburg trials. You must take responsibility for the decisions you render, even if they go beyond the imperfect regulatory standards. NRC has amended and granted exemptions from regulations that benefitted nuclear plant operators. You should be in the same position to be more inclusive in pursuit of public health and safety.

Further, the issue of long-term storage of high level nuclear wastes in the New York Metro area is still unresolved. As you are aware, regulations regarding separation of spent fuel assemblies in the storage pools have been amended to allow for dense packing that increases the likelihood that a loss of power or loss of water will result in a much larger release of radiation if the unexpected happens. The operators should be mandated to move all viable (i.e., sufficiently cooled) wastes to hardened dry cask storage to minimize the risk before any relicensing is approved. I am aware of the recent directive that an EIS regarding long term storage for each plant must be prepared within two years, but the agency should expedite the return to design basis standards for spent fuel storage pool configuration. You may not be aware that the spent fuel storage at Indian Point has the same design of hydrogen vents that failed at Fukushima Dai-ichi. This is not a small concern and warrants preventative measures.

Finally, it should be noted that analysis of US CDC county by county data shows that the three counties that surround Indian Point – Westchester, Rockland and Putnam – all have statistically significantly higher thyroid cancer rates than the nation overall. Further, recent reports from both Germany and France indicate that

childhood leukemia rates are elevated around nuclear power plants. Again, I ask that you act in the best interests of public health and safety by not recommending new licenses for Indian Point.

I also hope that you will refer to the recently issued NYISO 2012 Reliability Report that states unequivocally that Indian Point 2 can be retired at expiration of the current license with no impact on regional grid reliability, and that only under a high demand scenario at the time that IP3's license expires would there be a shortfall for reliability, and even then the shortfall would be 750MW if no additional capacity was available between now and then. Capacity could come from transmission upgrades, energy efficiency initiatives, demand response policies or additional generation.

The essential question becomes, why take the risks associated with Indian Point if the plant is not really necessary for the electrical grid?

Thank you for your consideration.

J Brookner

DOCKETED  
USNRC

September 14, 2012 (10:19 a.m.)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF