

EDO Principal Correspondence Control

FROM: DUE: 05/24/07

EDO CONTROL: G20070305  
DOC DT: 05/02/07  
FINAL REPLY:

Sherwood Martinelli, NY

TO:

Chairman Klein

FOR SIGNATURE OF :

\*\* GRN \*\*

CRC NO: 07-0311

Dyer, NRR

DESC:

ROUTING:

Indian Point License Renewal Application - Formal  
Request for Extension of Time

Reyes  
Virgilio  
Kane  
Ash  
Silber  
Ordaz  
Cyr/Burns  
Collins, RI

DATE: 05/03/07

ASSIGNED TO:

CONTACT:

NRR

Dyer

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR REMARKS:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL TICKET

Date Printed: May 02, 2007 17:15

---

**PAPER NUMBER:** LTR-07-0311 **LOGGING DATE:** 05/02/2007  
**ACTION OFFICE:** ED/GC  
  
**AUTHOR:** Mr. Sherwood Martinelli  
**AFFILIATION:** NY  
**ADDRESSEE:** NRC Chairman  
**SUBJECT:** Indian Point License Renewal Application - Formal Request for Extension to Time  
  
**ACTION:** Direct Reply  
**DISTRIBUTION:** RF, SECY/RAS, SECY to Ack  
  
**LETTER DATE:** 05/02/2007  
  
**ACKNOWLEDGED:** No  
**SPECIAL HANDLING:** Immediate release to public via SECY/EDO/DPC  
  
**NOTES:**  
  
**FILE LOCATION:** ADAMS  
  
**DATE DUE:** 05/24/2007 **DATE SIGNED:**

EDO --G20070305

## CHAIRMAN - Indian Point License Renewal Application-Formal Request For Extension of Time

---

**From:** <RoycePenstinger@aol.com>  
**To:** <chairman@nrc.gov>, <lisa@riverkeeper.org>, <Palisadesart@aol.com>, <pgunter@nirs.org>, <judya814@comcast.net>, <acer8sac@comcast.net>, <garyfromvermont@yahoo.com>, <mannajo@clearwater.org>  
**Date:** 05/02/2007 2:51 PM  
**Subject:** Indian Point License Renewal Application-Formal Request For Extension of Time

---

Dear Chairman:

This week Entergy formally filed its Application for License Renewal with the NRC for Indian Point Reactors 2 and 3. The licensee has spent no less than one year preparing this document for submission, with perhaps tens of thousands of man hours involved in the document preparation process. The application, and its underlying support documents are some 2000 pages in length, and reference 100's if not thousands of rules, regulations and industry citations. The sheer volume of the application and its underlying citations is far too immense to adequately address in the time NRC has allotted. (24-30 months, with 30 months planned only if a hearing is requested.) In fact, it is pointed out to you, that NRC's manual answering COMMONLY asked questions in the license renewal process is over 100 pages in length. I've spent the better part of six hours today alone, surfing the NRC's web site to familiarize myself with the revised re-licensing rules and regulations.

The NRC gives little if any merit to citizen desires, opinions and views, especially if they are not backed up by factual arguments with appropriate citation of sources to validate one's allegations. In short, to be actively involved, to adequately exercise one's rights as a citizen stakeholder in the re-licensing process requires a tremendous amount of work and research if one intends to articulately discuss and defend their concerns and objections.

As a stakeholder living a scant three miles from Indian Point's aging, brittle reactors, it is my intention to file for intervenor status, as well as request a hearing at the appropriate place and time. However, my primary concern in the immediate moment is to have adequate time to research, study and disseminate the Indian Point License Renewal Application, and its various assorted underlying documents and cites, so that I can fully participate in the public meeting process from beginning to end. This need is of paramount importance, especially after the NRC egregiously mitigated public participation to facilitate a faster re-licensing schedule by limiting/reducing the number of public meeting opportunities available to us in host communities. In short, we cannot waste our limited opportunities because we are unfamiliar with and uneducated about the issues going in to the process.

Speaking with various friends of mine within the legal community today, explaining to them the volumes of material that need to be waded through to be properly prepared for even the first public meeting, pointing out that I as a lone singular stakeholder have no help in the information dissemination task, it was decided that a period of 18 months before the first public meeting is held would be both adequate and fair, and would serve to protect my rights as a stakeholder, and such an extension of time would be commiserate with the allotted Entergy in preparing said document. Further, because Entergy has submitted their license renewal application years before their current licenses would terminate, such a time extension would not create time constraint issues for them. Lastly, this request is doubly fair, since we in the stakeholder community are being forced to defend against not one, but two license renewal applications simultaneously, which further complicates our task.

For these reasons, I hereby move and request that NRC, and the commission grant my reasonable request for an extension of time for document review before any public meeting is held, of eighteen months, with the time clock on said extension beginning the day after all documents contained in the Entergy Indian Point License Application packet are made FULLY available to me. (note...a letter from your online document room staff received today indicates that some of said documents are under review, and they were not sure when they would be made available to members of the general public.). I thank you, and the staff of the NRC for your due diligence in consideration of this matter.

Respectfully,

Sherwood Martinelli  
351 Dyckman Street

Peekskill, New York 10566  
(914) 734-1955

---

See what's free at [AOL.com](http://AOL.com).

**Mail Envelope Properties** (4638DD8F.6F6 : 5 : 26358)

**Subject:** Indian Point License Renewal Application-Formal Request For  
Extension of Time  
**Creation Date** Wed, May 2, 2007 2:50 PM  
**From:** <[RoycePenstinger@aol.com](mailto:RoycePenstinger@aol.com)>  
**Created By:** [RoycePenstinger@aol.com](mailto:RoycePenstinger@aol.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

OWGWPO02.HQGWDO01  
CHAIRMANclearwater.org  
mannajoyahoo.com  
garyfromvermontcomcast.net  
acer8sac  
judya814nirs.org  
pgunteraol.com  
Palisadesartriverkeeper.org  
lisa**Post Office**

OWGWPO02.HQGWDO01

**Route**nrc.gov  
clearwater.org  
yahoo.com  
comcast.net  
nirs.org  
aol.com  
riverkeeper.org**Files**

MESSAGE

**Size**

4318

**Date & Time**

Wednesday, May 2, 2007 2:50 PM

TEXT.htm 5285  
Mime.822 11543

**Options**

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

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**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