

THE BUFFALO NEWS

Letter: Nuclear power opinion does not consider factors

By *Staff* | Published July 24, 2019

In *Another Voice*, July 18, Professor Michael D. Garrick supports the continued use of nuclear power to avoid the limitations he sees in today's wind and solar power for meeting New York's energy needs while averting the climate crisis.

Unfortunately, the organization he co-founded, the Stable Climate Organization, has an outdated view of nuclear power, judging from its web page and Garrick's uncritical view of nukes. The web page references Chernobyl as the nuclear accident that people worry about (needlessly, they say, because the Soviet reactor was a type never built here).

There is no mention of the 2011 Fukushima disaster, at a General Electric-designed reactor with sister plants of the same design throughout the United States, including the Nine Mile Point reactors in New York State.

Stable Climate Organization's optimistic views about the recycling and deep geological burial of nuclear waste reference a 20-year-old report, despite the setbacks to both reprocessing and deep burial in the U.S. over the last 20 years. Those of us concerned about the future of the West Valley Nuclear Fuel Services site are only too aware of those challenges.

Location is everything in real estate, they say, and in nuclear sites as well. At Fukushima, advance warnings about the coastal location being prone to earthquakes and tsunamis were not sufficiently factored into the design. At West Valley, a geologically unstable site was chosen for nuclear reprocessing in the 1960s.

Garrick advocates keeping the accident-prone Indian Point Energy Center on line. The location of Indian Point on the Hudson River is striking – in a densely populated metropolitan area 35 miles north of midtown Manhattan. How would you evacuate the area downstream of a nuclear accident at Indian Point?

William Townsend Ph.D., Amherst