

Vivian Palmer

The DEC should not provide a siting permit for microreactors. Though nuclear energy does not produce air pollution during the reaction process and thus is touted as "clean energy," other forms of pollution caused by nuclear energy are very damaging and would have a profound negative impact on Alaska. First, nuclear reaction produces heat pollution. Hot waste water would affect already threatened salmon spawning as well as the survival rates of other species of fish (as fish and other aquatic organism are highly sensitive to temperature changes). Any impact on fishing would severely damage the Alaskan economy and Alaskan subsistence living. Excess heated water could also damage permafrost layers if not properly contained. Nuclear waste is highly toxic and would require long term storage planning. Transporting waste across the state would pose a risk to anyone within its path. It would also pose security risks as the waste will be more vulnerable during this period of transit, and should it not be transported safely, there would be very large ramifications on the state of Alaska and beyond. Nuclear waste storage risks damaging fragile ecosystems and making public land inaccessible. Multiple studies demonstrate that those who live within a certain radius of nuclear power plants and waste storage sites are at a higher risk of cancer and other ailments. Not only would this risk affect Alaskan citizens but also the wild game we rely on either for subsistence or from its impact on the local economy. There are many other low impact methods of energy production that should be considered before nuclear power to meet Alaska's energy needs. For example, solar and wind energy could help meet these needs without so greatly affecting the wildlife and lands Alaskans and the Alaskan economy rely upon so greatly.