

Davis-BesseNPEm Resource

From: Cooper, Paula
Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2011 11:07 AM
To: Cooper, Paula
Attachments: [Untitled].pdf

Hearing Identifier: Davis_BesseLicenseRenewal_Saf_NonPublic
Email Number: 845

Mail Envelope Properties (95dfc1d2-e11d-41a9-a2af-941d6ae3b60f)

Subject:
Sent Date: 1/19/2011 11:06:59 AM
Received Date: 1/19/2011 11:07:02 AM
From: Cooper, Paula

Created By: Paula.Cooper@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Cooper, Paula" <Paula.Cooper@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: TWMS01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2	1/19/2011 11:07:02 AM
[Untitled].pdf	1349320	

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received:

9/20/10
75 FR 57299
(4)

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
11/10

2011 JAN -4 AM 9:02

RECEIVED
Joseph DeMare
1111 West Elm Tree Road
Rossford, Ohio 43460
electricity2@cs.com

December 27, 2010

Cindy Bladey, Chief
Rules, Announcements and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: TWB-05-B01M
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Regarding: **Docket No. 50-346; NRC-2010-0298**

Dear Ms. Bladey:

Please find enclosed the following items:

- (1) 59 Page Transcript entitled "The People's Hearing on Davis-Besse Relicensing"
- (1) Data Stick Labeled "Davis-Besse Relicensing Public Comments 12-18-10"
- (1) DVD Disk
- (24) Pages of Supporting Documentation

The data stick contains a video file (WMV format) of a hearing regarding FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company's Environmental Impact Statement submitted as part of its Application for extending Facility Operating License No. NPF-003 for an additional 20-Year Period for the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1. The hearing was held on December 18, 2010 at St Mark's Episcopal Church in the city of Toledo, Ohio. It was organized by the Sierra Club of Ohio and the Green Party of Ohio as well as their local chapters in Lucas and Wood Counties. Written on the data stick also, are electronic versions of the documents included in the subfolder "Supporting Documentation."

The digital information written on the data stick and DVD disks is a compilation of comments which are hereby submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) as part of the Scoping Process. The Transcript is a written version of testimony recorded at the hearing. The Supporting Documentation is a printed version of slides and reports that were presented during the hearing. As the creator of this video, I hereby give the NRC

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

1

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = P.Cooper (pec)

permission to display it on their website as part of the public comments available for viewing by the general public.

The DVD disk contains testimony collected on December 11, 2010 by Pat Marida in Columbus, Ohio.

The video recording of the hearing has a list of speakers with a time reference for your convenience at the beginning of the video. Each speaker's name is written on the screen for the first 15 seconds of their presentation. The following persons testified:

Anita Rios	Joe DeMare (myself)	Kevin Kamps
Al Compaan	Katie Hoepfl	Tony Szilagye
Ed McArdle	Phyllis Oster	David Ellison
Michael Keegan	Ralph Semrock	Mike Leonardi

Had this comment period occurred during a different part of the year, we would have had many more participants. Many of the people we contacted regarding the hearing had already made travel plans and were unable to attend. If the NRC's goal was to limit public participation in the process, they could not have picked a more effective time period for comments.

I would suggest that, if the NRC is seeking public participation, future relicensing application comment periods be limited to the first ten months of the calendar year.

I have one additional Scoping comment. Repeatedly, as I organized this response, I heard the same statement from many people, "The process is rigged. Trying to comment or oppose the relicensing application is a waste of time because the NRC always approves every relicensing application." There has been a loss of faith in the NRC's ability to regulate the nuclear industry. If the NRC approves this particular application, for what is arguably the worst nuclear plant in the country in terms of safety, environmental impact, and history of evasion and deception, then it will be clear to all observers that all applications will be approved. **The environmental review must include the social and cultural impact of the widespread belief that the NRC exists, not to protect the public, but to protect the nuclear industry at any cost. This loss of faith in the federal government is, at best, corrosive to the democratic process and, at worst, a cause of terrorist activities.** For Davis-Besse, the cost includes the lives of the children living near the plant who are suffering from rising thyroid cancer rates. NRC's record \$33 million dollar fine is approximately one month's revenue from the plant. Nuclear plant operators will now simply be able to budget one month's revenue as the cost of doing business, because no matter how seriously a plant operator flaunts NRC directives or imperils the health and safety of the public, or how many times they lie about having "reformed" their procedures and attitudes, their license renewals will be automatically granted. Denying Davis-Besse's application will at least create a base line. Applicants will know that they have to at least be "better than Davis-Besse" in order to be approved. This is a very low standard, indeed. The plant is currently unable to meet the NRC's

environmental and safety regulations, suffering frequent shut downs. In twenty more years, as the plant deteriorates from age and neutron bombardment, it is more likely to suffer catastrophic failure. But, if the application is approved, even this low standard will not be low enough. Applicants will know that they can be “as bad as Davis-Besse” and still receive the NRC's rubber stamp of approval.

Please contact me at (419)973-5841 or electricity2@cs.com if you have any questions, or if there is any kind of problem with the Scoping Comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Joseph DeMare".

Joseph DeMare