

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: Speiser, Herald
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2016 10:42 AM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Subject: Comment on ANPR-26, 50, 52, 73, and 140 - Regulatory Improvements for Decommissioning
Attachments: NRC-2015-0070-DRAFT-0039.pdf

DOCKETED BY USNRC—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SECY-067

PR#: ANPR-26, 50, 52, 73, and 140

FRN#: 80FR72358

NRC DOCKET#: NRC-2015-0070

SECY DOCKET DATE: 2/26/16

TITLE: Regulatory Improvements for Decommissioning Power Reactors

COMMENT#: 040

As of: 2/26/16 9:35 AM Received: February 24, 2016 Status: Pending_Post Tracking No. 1k0-8o53-ncfd Comments Due: March 18, 2016 Submission Type: Web

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

Docket: NRC-2015-0070

Regulatory Improvements for Power Reactors Transitioning to Decommissioning

Comment On: NRC-2015-0070-0007

Regulatory Improvements for Decommissioning Power Reactors; Extension of Comment Period

Document: NRC-2015-0070-DRAFT-0039

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-32599

Submitter Information

Name: Marvin Resnikoff

Address:

Box 105

Bellows Falls, VT, 05101

Email: radwaste@rwma.com

General Comment

Changes to Nuclear Reactor

Decommissioning Regulations

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Advance Notice Of Proposed Rulemaking: Request For Comment

Comments by Dr. Marvin Resnikoff

The basic issue is that insufficient funds are set aside for decommissioning reactors. The basic reason is that the NRC is attempting through every means to ensure that reactor operation is an economically viable business. But it cannot compete with low cost solar and gas on a level playing field. Hence, the NRC is allowing utilities to postpone decommissioning for 60 years, in SAFSTOR. In this way valuable property remains unusable, if and when, decommissioning funds become available to take apart reactors. It has long been my position that the land upon which reactors sit should be taken by eminent domain, and that reactors should be removed so that the State can locate more productive uses for a site. This has been opposed by utilities and the NRC on various grounds. First and foremost, that insufficient funds are available to decommission reactors. But secondly, that such a legal process would be unsafe and that the NRC must guarantee safety. However, there is a precedent, low-level waste burial grounds. The NRC presently requires that States hold title to burial grounds for the obvious reasons that burial grounds will remain radioactive and

hazardous for long periods of time, and only the State can guarantee that it will be existent for such long periods of time. A similar reasoning should hold for nuclear reactors and utilities.

To contrast the regulation of decommissioning with other countries, one should look to Germany, where \$44 billion has been set aside for decommissioning reactors. At Vermont Yankee, less than \$600 million has been set aside and much of this is being frittering away with matters unrelated to decommissioning a reactor. Salaries alone account for almost 2% a year from the fund. A large amount will go to high level waste storage, only 80% of which may be returned from the Department of Energy. In short, it is unlikely that sufficient funds will be available in 60 years. But in a way, this is not the point. Had the full amount been available for decommissioning when the VY plant closed, the cost of nuclear electricity would have been higher and alternative sources of electricity would have been more viable, leading to a more rapid decline of nuclear power. Rather than an independent and disinterested regulator of nuclear power, the NRC has become a proponent, a booster of nuclear power, contrary to its Congressional original mandate.