

SUNSI Review Complete
Template=ADM-013
E-RIDS=ADM-03
ADD: Laura Willingham,
Mary Richmond, Antoinette
Walker-Smith, Marlayna
Doell, Mary Neely

Comment (51)
Publication Date:6/27/2024
Citation: 89 FR 53659

As of: 7/29/24, 12:28 PM
Received: July 27, 2024
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. lz4-05g8-ndjm
Comments Due: July 29, 2024
Submission Type: API

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

Docket: NRC-2024-0076

Notice of Intent to Conduct Scoping Process and Prepare an Environmental Assessment Holtec Decommissioning International, LLC and Holtec Palisades, LLC; Palisades Nuclear Plant, Unit 1

Comment On: NRC-2024-0076-0001

Holtec Decommissioning International, LLC, and Holtec Palisades, LLC; Palisades Nuclear Plant; Notice of Intent To Conduct Scoping Process and Prepare an Environmental Assessment

Document: NRC-2024-0076-DRAFT-0051

Comment on FR Doc # 2024-14112

Submitter Information

Name: Lawrence Flynn

General Comment

Are you all INSANE!!!!

If you choose to go ahead with this plan, you certainly will be on the wrong side of history -- and the greed and power play that is leading the charge here will be shamed for decades to come. Don't allow this.

Why?

Palisades since its opening in 1971 has been plagued with serious problems and violations. In fact, in 2012 it was classified as the worst performing reactor in the nation. After 50 years it finally was shuttered in May of 2022, a week and a half earlier than planned due to control rod failure which is essential for safe operation.

Even you, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission had declared Palisades one of the four worst-performing plants in the country.

Propping up a damaged nuclear power plant that has leaked in the past and has already been shut down is a foolish way to use state funds - when private companies decided this facility should be shut down and proceeded with doing that, spending taxpayer dollars to resuscitate an outdated and dangerous nuclear power plant is fiscally irresponsible

Bringing a nuclear plant back online has never been done in the U.S. and the company Holtec International who has a bad track record, is better known for decommissioning nuclear plants, not building one. They have never held a reactor operating license.

Nuclear energy is risky, dirty, dangerous, slow, and expensive. Instead, our state should be pursuing our cleanest, quickest, safest, and cheapest energy options.

Saddling the state with the high costs and the dangers of nuclear energy is not needed to ensure Michigan will continue to have reliable power. Palisades hasn't been providing power for two years now. We've heard over and over that companies considering investment in Michigan have passed on our state because we do not have functional public transit and this is what we are investing in? How many homes could be insulated, solarized and converted to non-fossil fuel heating sources instead? With \$300 million let alone \$1.5 billion from feds for this. Think of how many more jobs we could create?

Rather than doubling down on this risky plant we should be:

Enabling new transmission capacity throughout our region;

Expanding and expediting investments in large-scale solar and wind energy installations;

Developing more utility scale, residential, and commercial storage capacity to provide energy in high demand times, further stabilize the grid and incur less cost to residents;

Ramping up efficiency and demand response programs to help residents and businesses conserve energy, save money, and shave peak demand;

Removing the barriers and restrictions on distributed and community-owned energy generation.

Seeking the best and most innovative solutions for Michigan's power needs. For example, Green Mountain Power in Vermont taps into homeowners' batteries during peak times, lowering the cost and peak demand of electricity for all customers in the Green Mountain Power service area.

Many independent voices and studies show that with a combination of renewables, energy efficiency, storage, demand response, and things like distributed generation, we can absolutely meet our energy needs without nuclear. This is just a waste of taxpayer money.

According to the independent World Nuclear Industry Status Report, nuclear energy "meets no technical or operational need that low-carbon competitors cannot meet better, cheaper and faster."

As rising Great Lakes water levels, storm surges and heavy rainfall erodes coastal and inland flood defenses, Palisades and other nuclear plants storing waste along our waterways are not a safe bet in a changing climate. Efforts to build and upgrade plants resistant to climate change will significantly increase the already considerable expense involved in building, operating and decommissioning nuclear plants. This should prompt a substantial reassessment of nuclear's role in helping Michigan and this country reach net zero emissions.