

As of: 6/14/17 9:08 AM
Received: June 13, 2017
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 1k1-8wy0-w91c
Comments Due: June 13, 2017
Submission Type: Web

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

Docket: NRC-2015-0070

Regulatory Improvements for Power Reactors Transitioning to Decommissioning

Comment On: NRC-2015-0070-0178

Regulatory Improvements for Power Reactors Transitioning to Decommissioning; Request for Comment on Draft Regulatory Basis

Document: NRC-2015-0070-DRAFT-0225

Comment on FR Doc # 2017-05141

Submitter Information

Name: Ramona Lake

Address:

2400 Wright Street
Madison, WI, 53704

Email: ramona.lake@wisconsin.gov

General Comment

Wisconsin Emergency Management Response to NRC's Preliminary Draft Regulatory Analysis for Regulatory Basis: Regulatory Improvements for Decommissioning
Docket ID NRC-2015-0070

Summary

The U.S. NRC draft regulatory basis to amend regulations for the decommissioning of nuclear power reactors outlines choices for proposed rulemaking for specific areas to support regulatory improvements for reactors transitioning to decommissioning. Wisconsin Emergency Management (WEM) supports the following:

3.3 The 60-year Timeframe Associated with Decommissioning

The current timeframe available for decommissioning was established as part of the original decommissioning regulations promulgated in 1988. As part of the current rulemaking activity, the (NRC) staff considered whether the decommission timeline should be adjusted, given the advantages in dismantlement and decontamination technologies since the decommissioning regulations were last updated.

Of the three options presented, WEM supports Alternative T-3 (Rulemaking to Codify the Decommissioning Timeframe) over Alternative T-1 (No-Action) or Alternative T-2 (Guidance Development/Enhancement).

Alternative T-3 would expedite the decommissioning process, easing the potential negative impacts of the local off-site communities.

3.4 The Role of State and Local Governments and Non-Governmental Stakeholders

Although the NRC does not have authority or jurisdiction to direct governmental and non-governmental entities to participate in the decommissioning of a facility, the NRC regulations currently offer the public an opportunity to review licensee submittals and provide input during many stages of the commissioning process.

Of the three options presented, WEM supports Alternative GOV-3 (Rulemaking to Codify State/Local/Non-Government involvement) over Alternative GOV-1 (No-Action) or Alternative GOV-2 (Guidance Development/Enhancement). GOV-3 allows for greater public participation through the creation of a community advisory board giving input for consideration of local off-site communities during the decommissioning process. WEM recommends offsite stakeholders oversee the facilitation of the community advisory board.

3.5 Clarifying the Spent Fuel Management Recommendations

Prior rulemaking required a licensee to submit a detailed Decommissioning Plan before the licensee could begin dismantlement or any major decommissioning activities which includes spent fuel management.

Of the three options presented, WEM supports Alternative SFM-2 (Guidance Development/Enhancement) over Alternative SFM-1 (No-Action) or Alternative SFM-3 (Rulemaking to clarify spent fuel management requirements). The creation of guidance documents that address the need for a licensee to consider or plan how to manage and remove spent fuel from their site before they decommission would be in the best interest of the local off-site providing an overall regulatory transparency.

4.2 Emergency Preparedness

Emergency planning and preparedness exemptions were approved by the NRC at permanently shut down and defueled power reactor sites based on the determination that there are no applicable design-basis events at a decommissioning licensee's facility that could result in an offsite radiological release exceeding the limits established by the EPA.

Of the three options presented, WEM supports Alternative EP-2 (Rulemaking to amend regulations to provide a graded approach to emergency preparedness/ emergency plan changes between levels with NRC approval) over Alternative EP-1 (No-Action) or EP-3 (Rulemaking to amend regulations to provide a graded approach to emergency preparedness/ emergency plan changes between levels without NRC Approval). WEM believes that there are still security risks present as long as a security force and spent fuel is on site and the need for interaction between the site and off-site's is pertinent.

Attachments

Wisconsin Emergency Management Response to NRC

Wisconsin Emergency Management Response to NRC's
Preliminary Draft Regulatory Analysis for Regulatory Basis:
Regulatory Improvements for Decommissioning
Docket ID NRC-2015-0070

Summary

The U.S. NRC draft regulatory basis to amend regulations for the decommissioning of nuclear power reactors outlines choices for proposed rulemaking for specific areas to support regulatory improvements for reactors transitioning to decommissioning. Wisconsin Emergency Management (WEM) supports the following:

3.3 The 60-year Timeframe Associated with Decommissioning

The current timeframe available for decommissioning was established as part of the original decommissioning regulations promulgated in 1988. At part of the current rulemaking activity, the (NRC) staff considered whether the decommission timeline should be adjusted, given the advantages in dismantlement and decontamination technologies since the decommissioning regulations were last updated.

Of the three options presented, **WEM supports Alternative T-3 (Rulemaking to Codify the Decommissioning Timeframe)** over Alternative T-1 (No-Action) or Alternative T-2 (Guidance Development/Enhancement). Alternative T-3 would expedite the decommissioning process, easing the potential negative impacts of the local off-site communities.

3.4 The Role of State and Local Governments and Non-Governmental Stakeholders

Although the NRC does not have authority or jurisdiction to direct governmental and non-governmental entities to participate in the decommissioning of a facility, the NRC regulations currently offer the public an opportunity to review licensee submittals and provide input during many stages of the commissioning process.

Of the three options presented, **WEM supports Alternative GOV-3 (Rulemaking to Codify State/Local/Non-Government involvement)** over Alternative GOV-1 (No-Action) or Alternative GOV-2 (Guidance Development/Enhancement). GOV-3 allows for greater public participation through the creation of a community advisory board giving input for consideration of local off-site communities during the decommissioning process. WEM recommends offsite stakeholders oversee the facilitation of the community advisory board.

3.5 Clarifying the Spent Fuel Management Recommendations

Prior rulemaking required a licensee to submit a detailed Decommissioning Plan before the licensee could begin dismantlement or any major decommissioning activities which includes spent fuel management.

Of the three options presented, **WEM supports Alternative SFM-2 (Guidance Development/Enhancement)** over Alternative SFM-1 (No-Action) or Alternative SFM-3 (Rulemaking to

clarify spent fuel management requirements). The creation of guidance documents that address the need for a licensee to consider or plan how to manage and remove spent fuel from their site before they decommission would be in the best interest of the local off-site providing an overall regulatory transparency.

4.2 Emergency Preparedness

Emergency planning and preparedness exemptions were approved by the NRC at permanently shut down and defueled power reactor sites based on the determination that there are no applicable design-basis events at a decommissioning licensee's facility that could result in an offsite radiological release exceeding the limits established by the EPA.

Of the three options presented, **WEM supports Alternative EP-2 (Rulemaking to amend regulations to provide a graded approach to emergency preparedness/ emergency plan changes between levels with NRC approval)** over Alternative EP-1 (No-Action) or EP-3 (Rulemaking to amend regulations to provide a graded approach to emergency preparedness/ emergency plan changes between levels without NRC Approval). WEM believes that there are still security risks present as long as a security force and spent fuel is on site and the need for interaction between the site and off-site's is pertinent.