

PRM-51-10
(71FR64169)

DOCKETED 03/20/07

Comment No. 61

I support the petition for rulemaking filed on August 25, 2006 by the Massachusetts Attorney General. I've never been a fan of the Pilgrim Nuclear Plant. Since 911 I've become more concerned than ever. I know with this license renewal process we aren't allowed to debate the lack of evacuation planning, the vulnerability of the spent fuel pool from an aerial attack, or the fact that the South Shore has now become a nuclear waste dump, but times have changed since these relicensing rules were made. Because times have changed, I believe that the rules should change. When the NRC developed these perimeters of discussion with a license renewal, everyone thought that the high-level waste would have been moved to a permanent repository. Because no repository has been licensed and there are no sites planned in the distant future, the 900 tons of high-level nuclear waste that has accumulated at Pilgrim will be stranded here for many years to come. This new license will enable Entergy to make another 600 tons of high-level nuclear waste in the next 20 years that will now have to be stored in Plymouth, also new information. Nuclear Plants are high on the terrorist's list of targets. Terrorists flying jets laden with fuel into structures is new information. Entergy has done nothing to protect that vulnerable spent fuel pool from the air. Entergy can station all the National Guard they can get around that plant but they won't protect it from the air. Terrorists will only become more sophisticated as time goes by. Our local evacuation plan that is supposed to be an ongoing process is a fairytale. Anyone that believes in this plan must work for the industry or is out of touch with reality. The population has exploded on the South Shore and the chances of escaping a nuclear event are slim, also new information. Recent reports suggesting that even low doses of radiation cause cancer is new information. Better monitoring is needed at and around the Pilgrim Plant before it gets relicensed. As one terrorism expert recently said, Entergy may run the plant well but as far as security goes that's another subject. Let's all work to change the process of relicensing nuclear power plants so that the communities that live with them can feel at least a little bit more secure. I don't know where our local politicians stand on this issue other than the fact that they want to get more money from Entergy. It's time for them to take a stand. There are other alternatives for that site on Rocky Hill Road. Plymouth has way too much going for it to become a nuclear waste dump.

Thanks
Wedge Bramhall Plymouth MA

Template = SECY-067

SECY-02

From: Carol Gallagher
To: SECY
Date: Tue, Mar 20, 2007 1:01 PM
Subject: Comment on PRM-51-10

Attached for docketing is a comment letter on the above noted PRM from Wedge Bramhall that I received via the rulemaking website.

Carol

Mail Envelope Properties (4600136F.213 : 5 : 35764)

Subject: Comment on PRM-51-10
Creation Date Tue, Mar 20, 2007 1:01 PM
From: Carol Gallagher

Created By: CAG@nrc.gov

Recipients

nrc.gov

TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
 SECY (SECY)

Post Office

TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	544	Tuesday, March 20, 2007 1:01 PM
TEXT.htm	413	
bramhall.wpd	15234	Tuesday, March 20, 2007 12:59 PM

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
ReplyRequested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results

Message is not eligible for Junk Mail handling
 Message is from an internal sender

Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered

Junk Mail handling disabled by User
 Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator
 Junk List is not enabled
 Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled
 Block List is not enabled