

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
UD:DC

As of: 3/16/15 3:43 PM
Received: February 27, 2015
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 1jz-8hfr-5b8j
Comments Due: March 23, 2015
Submission Type: Web

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

2015 MAR 16 PM 4:16

RECEIVED

Docket: NRC-2015-0004

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report

Comment On: NRC-2015-0004-0001

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report

Document: NRC-2015-0004-DRAFT-0007

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-00450

Submitter Information

Name: Valerie Stuart

Address:

520 Meadowbrook Road
Brattleboro, VT, 05301

Email: vstuart@leg.state.vt.us

⑤
1/14/2015
80 FR 1975

General Comment

February 27, 2015

Dear Sirs,

We write in response to your Post Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report (PSDAR). In our role as Vermont State Senators and Representatives of many Windham County towns, we want the following points to be part of the public record.

We do not support SAFSTOR. Costs will only go up and contamination will spread by waiting up to 60 years as is currently allowed by the NRC. Our community is a special case that will not benefit from a cookie cutter approach. We are only the second merchant reactor to decommission. Moreover, Entergy is located on the second smallest land area of any US nuclear plant. It also is located in the middle of a town and has an elementary school located across from the gate to the plant. All of these factors contribute to making Entergy an unsuitable site for SAFSTOR. We also feel we have a moral obligation to deal effectively with this problem and not to leave it for future generations.

We request maintenance of the emergency planning zone and federal funding for emergency personnel until all fuel is removed from the spent fuel pool into dry cask storage.

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM - 013

E-RIDS= ADM-03

Add= J. Kim (JSK)

As a community that hosts high level nuclear waste -- a role we never signed on for -- we request federal help to cover the cost of expenses we are unprepared to shoulder. If Entergy can sue the federal government for millions of dollars for not removing the waste in 1998 as scheduled, why can't we access the federal nuclear waste fund to pay for infrastructure, keep us safe and support our emergency personnel? Major incentives are made available to communities willing to take nuclear waste. So why shouldn't towns like ours that have that job thrust upon us receive such incentives?

In the absence of any federal or interim repository, we request higher quality casks like those used in Europe and Japan.

We believe removing the waste from the spent fuel pools should start before 2019. Such pools pose a catastrophic risk should a loss of power occur. There is currently fuel in the pool that meets the standard of having cooled for 5 years that can and should be removed now.

We hope and expect you will give our concerns special consideration in view of the fact that we represent many of the communities that will be most affected by Entergys closure.

Sincerely,

Vermont State Representatives Valerie A. Stuart, Tristan Toleno, Mollie Burke, David Deen, Mike Mrowicki, Emily Long, Ann Manwaring

Vermont State Senators Jeanette White and Becca Baliant

Attachments

WCD NRC Letter 2.27.15



STATE OF VERMONT

February 27, 2015

Dear Sirs,

We write in response to your Post Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report (PSDAR). We want the following points to be part of the public record.

We do not support SAFSTOR. Costs will only go up and contamination will spread by waiting up to 60 years as is currently allowed by the NRC. Our community is a special case that will not benefit from a cookie cutter approach. We are only the second merchant reactor to decommission. Moreover, Entergy is located on the second smallest land area of any US nuclear plant. It also is located in the middle of a town and has an elementary school located across from the gate to the plant. All of these factors contribute to making Entergy an unsuitable site for SAFSTOR. We also feel we have a moral obligation to deal effectively with this problem and not to leave it for future generations.

We request maintenance of the emergency planning zone and federal funding for emergency personnel until all fuel is removed from the spent fuel pool into dry cask storage.

As a community that hosts high level nuclear waste -- a role we never signed on for -- we request federal help to cover the cost of expenses we are unprepared to shoulder. If Entergy can sue the federal government for millions of dollars for not removing the waste in 1998 as scheduled, why can't we access the federal nuclear waste fund to pay for infrastructure, keep us safe and support our emergency personnel? Major incentives are made available to communities willing to take nuclear waste. So why shouldn't towns like ours that have that job thrust upon us receive such incentives?

In the absence of any federal or interim repository, we request higher quality casks like those used in Europe and Japan.

We believe removing the waste from the spent fuel pools should start before 2019. Such pools pose a catastrophic risk should a loss of power occur. There is currently fuel in the pool that meets the standard of having cooled for 5 years that can and should be removed now.

We hope and expect you will give our concerns special consideration in view of the fact that we represent many of the communities that will be most affected by Entergy's closure.

Sincerely,

Representatives Valerie A. Stuart, Tristan Toleno, Mollie Burke, David Deen, Mike Mrowicki, Emily Long, Ann Manwaring

Senators Jeanette White and Becca Balian