

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2016 7:02 PM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Subject: Comment on ANPR-26, 50, 52, 73, and 140 - Regulatory Improvements for Decommissioning
Attachments: Comment from Sachs.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: 3/22/16

TITLE: Regulatory Improvements for Decommissioning Power Reactors

COMMENT#: 132

As of: 3/22/16 9:40 AM Received: March 18, 2016 Status: Pending_Post Tracking No. 1k0-8okg-1t3s 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-0096

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-32599

Submitter Information

Name: Gary Sachs

General Comment

Dear members of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

I write you today re changes to decommissioning rules regarding decommissioned nuclear reactors. The NRC is and has been remiss. It is wrong for the NRC to allow most of the decommissioning rules to be voluntary, not compulsory. It is wrong to not have fully funded decommissioning trust plans before a reactor shuts such as here in VT. To allow a company to say, if the financial markets permit the money money shall be available in the future. This is wrong. Entergy is a multi billion dollar corporation which should be made by the Federal regulators to fully fund the decommission, not to wait until the fund has the money. We all know there is vulnerability investing in the markets.

There is something wrong that the state housing the reactor has so little say over the process of decommissioning. As you all know, the NRC has been a captive regulator to the industry since your inception in the seventies. You deal with an invisible public health concern, yet your choices invariably favor the industry you are mandated to promote and protect. I see something wrong morally in this. Granted we all may not be educated nuclear physicists or operators, it should not be on our backs to protect ourselves from this for profit toxin being put into the environment by each operating atomic reactor.

Safstor is neither safe nor stored. Why would the NRC continue to permit companies like Entergy to use the Holtec Hi Storm 100 units which have no heat monitoring within the canisters- in fact - no way at all to monitor what occurs inside the casks. How nice that Holtec, a US company, has made a cheaper, less effective, dry cask. I do not believe that leaving waste in canisters by expired reactors is a wise choice. My guess is

the NRC wants these reactors with no utilities behind them to go away as quietly as possible. I believe the NRC has failed their mandate to protect public health in the process.

Here in VT, we no longer have Resident Inspectors near our closed nuke. Also in a month we are to lose a significant portion of the emergency protective area surrounding the closed reactor. Still, a few years from

now, Entergy will have to move the waste from the Spent fuel pool (95% hot- what is spent about this?) to the poor choice of Entergy's bargain basement pre-buy el cheapo Holtec casks. Without an emergency protective area bigger than the frequently expanding footprint of the reactor site.

The use of the decommissioning fund for all post shutdown activities is unjust. The Decommissioning trust funds were designed to make certain the reactors could be decommissioned safely ... Not only has the NRC bastardized the process permitting safstor- but to allow the decommissioning trust funds - ratepayer moneys- to be used for purposes other than decommissioning- waste movement- etc. is wrong.