

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2016 6:00 PM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Subject: Comment on ANPR-26, 50, 52, 73, and 140 - Regulatory Improvements for Decommissioning
Attachments: NRC-2015-0070-DRAFT-0082.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: 3/17/16

TITLE: Regulatory Improvements for Decommissioning Power Reactors

COMMENT#: 087

As of: 3/17/16 4:06 PM
Received: March 17, 2016
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 1k0-8ojr-ekwf
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-0082

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-32599

Submitter Information

Name: Irene Paine

Address:

PO Box 823

Yarmouth Port, MA, 02675

Email: irenepaine@gmail.com

General Comment

Dear Members of the NRC and Commissioners,

Thank you for at long last scrutinizing the rules and regulations for the decommissioning of power reactors. As many aging reactors are closing down now or soon, each with their own unique geographical and location-based factors, you must be very busy with the process.

I live on Cape Cod in Yarmouth, Massachusetts. I agree with everything that Mary Lampert of Pilgrim Watch has suggested to you in her comments, submitted March 1, 2016.

We Cape Codders are extremely concerned about the exemptions that Entergy has requested in Vermont for Yankee, and know the same requests and more will be coming for the announced closing of the Pilgrim reactor. Everyone on Cape Cod lives under the shadow of that reactor, and as any 5th grader here will tell you, there is no escape from the cape in case of an accidental radiological event. We have hurricanes here, we have Nor'easter storms here, and the Pilgrim site is an aging cement structure with vulnerable, overloaded cooling pools.

As you are aware, the chances of a far-reaching radiological event actually increases when the reactor is "turned off", because staff is reduced. However the radioactive rods in the cooling pools will remain there after the closing of the plant, especially the ones most recently added, as they must cool for a specific amount

of time before being moved to dry cask storage. Many of the rods, however, have been there long enough to be moved now, thus reducing the chances of catastrophic events. There should not be an option offered by the NRC to leave them there!

You are entrusted with our safety. Please be accountable to us for that, not to the corporate vendors of power who deem their reactors no longer profitable. Entergy is quite healthy judging by their website listing all the awards they have received for their excellent power service and all their holdings in the southern states, and just because this Louisiana-based company has set up the Pilgrim reactor, a merchant reactor, as an LLC, they must not be let off the hook by granting them exemptions.

The decommissioning funds must be spent exclusively on the process of removing spent fuel rods from cooling pools and into dry cask storage, radiological cleanup, and specifically not on operational expenses.

Further, the Emergency Planning Zones and the requirements for off-site insurance must be undiminished until the spent fuel pool is empty, since the dangers posed by the spent fuel in the pool can far outweigh the dangers posed by the reactor itself.

Thank you very much for your full consideration of the safety of the citizens and residents of the area.
Sincerely, Irene M. Paine, Yarmouth Port, Massachusetts