

8/22/2014  
79FR 49820

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

3

As of: October 30, 2014  
Received: October 29, 2014  
Status: Pending\_Post  
Tracking No. 1jy-8f7c-350a  
Comments Due: November 06, 2014  
Submission Type: Web

**Docket:** NRC-2014-0149  
Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the PSEG Site

**Comment On:** NRC-2014-0149-0001  
Early Site Permit for the PSEG Site; Request for Comment on Draft Environmental Impact Statement

**Document:** NRC-2014-0149-DRAFT-0007  
Comment on FR Doc # 2014-19983

RECEIVED  
2014 OCT 30 AM 9:43  
RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
SEARCH  
10/30/2014

## Submitter Information

**Name:** David Magyar

## General Comment

After attending the public meeting on the evening of October 23, 2014, in Middletown, DE and having the opportunity to ask a question and after reviewing the information provided in the U.S.NRCCs DEIS for an ESP at the PSEG site Readers Guide, I have come away with the following concerns:

that neither the presentation nor the EIS documentation address local/national economic, social, or health issues that might arise as a result of a severe or catastrophic event that would result in the release of significant amounts of radioactive materials into the environment;  
that the information presented to the "public" was too technical for the average person to comprehend thus minimizing the publics ability to make informed commentary; and  
there was no effort to explain the significance of the 50 mi. impact area designated on several maps.

Information presented in the ESI chapter 5.11 regarding the impact of a nuclear accident focused mainly on measures taken to prevent such an event and provided little or no information on the actual economic, social and health implications of such an event. What little information there was in the 31 pages of the 1500 page report, that addressed the consequences of a major release of radiation, was much too technical and the summary did nothing to put into context the overall effect of such an event. In fact the summary minimized the impact such an event would have by categorizing the impact level as "small." The report blatantly overlooks the potential impact to a region that is critical to the security and well being of the country. It overlooks the consequences of aggregating as many as five reactors in one location. When one takes into account the areas included in the 50 mi impact zone, one must consider that the sites proximity to major centers of commerce, population, transportation and national defense facilities make it a prime target for anyone seeking to have a major impact on our country.

If an event should occur that required the evacuation of and possible abandonment of the 50 mi. impact zone,

SUNSI Review Complete  
Template = ADA-013

E-RFD-ADA-03  
Call = A. Fetter (atf)

virtually the entire state of Delaware, most of southern New Jersey, most of the Philadelphia and parts of the Baltimore metropolitan areas would have to be evacuated; the Northeast transportation corridor would have to be abandoned; both the Delaware and Chesapeake bays would be contaminated closing them to shipping as well as a source of food and water; millions of people would loose their homes, their jobs and their health. How this could be considered a "small" level of impact is beyond reason.

Furthermore, the report does not address the possibility of a deliberately caused event designed to maximize damage, though in this day and age it should. It only considers the likelihood of "accident" events that are due to natural, design or human error causes. It tries to mitigate concerns of a nuclear catastrophe by pointing to the recent catastrophe at Fukushima and "lessons learned" from that event. I wonder if the people living near Fukushima were given similar assurances when that facility was being proposed? I wonder if the people living in the shadow of Chernobyl were given assurances that this was good for them and what happened at Three Mile Island in the United States could never happen in Russia. No matter how remote or unlikely, not to consider the ramifications of such an event would be irresponsible and should weigh heavily on granting approval. After all, we dont want the PSEG Salem Nuclear site be someone elses reference for "lessons learned?"

When one weighs the potential for catastrophic impact one has to consider that there may not be any good place to put a nuclear reactor in the state of New Jersey or for that matter, anywhere else along the northeast coast.