

From: Ryan Sedgeley <ryan.sedgeley@protonmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2024 2:44 AM
To: TerraPowerEnvironmental Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Comments on Docket ID NRC-2024-0078, Notice of Intent to Conduct Scoping Process and Prepare Environmental Impact Statement; US SFR Owner, LLC; Kemmerer Power Station Unit 1
Attachments: Comments on Docket ID NRC-2024-0078 Notice of Intent to Conduct Scoping Process and Prepare Environmental Impact Statement US SFR Owner LLC Kemmerer Power Station Unit 1.pdf

Please see my attached letter that contain comments on Comments on Docket ID NRC-2024-0078, Notice of Intent to Conduct Scoping Process and Prepare Environmental Impact Statement; US SFR Owner, LLC; Kemmerer Power Station Unit 1.

Thank You,

Ryan C. Sedgeley

He/Him/His
Montrose, CO
(C) 307-220-6084
[Email](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

Federal Register Notice: 89FR49917
Comment Number: 18

Mail Envelope Properties

(ZpAEIk40BQILIE4ZkQgecGV-PVTmygwdMPK3f84_n2vsaoqO0O9gSvji-JL2VO3gkJVBMtv1xjhf7XtzRuy
uKjVHnC5nXzE_-M2KUpQR8Gc=)

Subject: [External_Sender] Comments on Docket ID NRC-2024-0078, Notice of Intent to
Conduct Scoping Process and Prepare Environmental Impact Statement; US SFR Owner, LLC;
Kemmerer Power Station Unit 1

Sent Date: 7/26/2024 2:44:17 AM

Received Date: 7/26/2024 2:44:40 AM

From: Ryan Sedgeley

Created By: ryan.sedgeley@protonmail.com

Recipients:

"TerraPowerEnvironmental Resource" <TerraPowerEnvironmental.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

Post Office: protonmail.com

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	486	7/26/2024 2:44:40 AM
Comments on Docket ID NRC-2024-0078 Notice of Intent to Conduct Scoping Process and Prepare Environmental Impact Statement US SFR Owner LLC Kemmerer Power Station Unit 1.pdf 155460		

Options

Priority: Normal

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Ryan Sedgeley
947 S 12th Street
Montrose, CO 81401
Ryan.Sedgeley@protonmail.com

July 25, 2024

Office of Administration
Mail Stop: TWFN-7-A60M
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001
ATTN: Program Management, Announcements and Editing Staff
TerraPowerEnvironmental@nrc.gov

Dear Commission,

I am writing to provide public comment on the proposal to Notice of Intent to Conduct Scoping Process and Prepare Environmental Impact Statement; US SFR Owner, LLC; Kemmerer Power Station Unit 1, Docket ID NRC-2024-0078.

The proposed project is deeply concerning to me for multiple reasons, primarily that the project has been pushed forward with a dangerous and reckless focus on speed rather than ensuring that this project is safe, actually makes sense financially for taxpayers, and that it is the proper use of funding in the midst of our current climate crisis. These are some of my primary concerns along with others outlined below that I think should be explained and evaluated as part of this EIS.

First this experimental reactor has been pushed forward with “streamlining” regulations as a selling point. This is being done without very clear and publicized reasons why it is safe to do this with detailed and robust explanations. The emphasis has been on speed not safety, that unnecessarily puts our communities and people’s lives at risk to accidents and disaster. This is especially true given the experimental nature of this reactor and the long history of problems with reactors that have used sodium as coolant. This includes meltdowns, fires, leaks, and nuclear non-proliferation issues. There is a serious lack of transparency around this project. Rather than telling the public what the industry and a Wyoming senator wants the NRC to say and do, the public needs to be able to trust that you are first and foremost looking out for our safety and well-being. Remember, for-profit companies will cut corners and will not put public safety at the top of their priorities, just look to the near disaster at Davis-Bessie, this is why close oversight is critical for machines with so much concentrated energy and potential for disaster. There should be no waivers of regulations and a clear system of transparency needs to be established and explained.

My second concern deals with the financial impacts of this project. The Department of Energy is planning to squander billions of taxpayer dollars on a measly 350-400 MW power plant. This is outrageously wasteful considering that there are many other viable and affordable renewable energy projects that come with none of the risks or drawbacks of this nuclear experiment. That is only the money pledged to build the actual plant. The DOE is also working to waste more taxpayer money for the production of specialized HALEU fuel. All this for one tiny power plant that uses a coolant and fuel that has been abandoned in nearly every other case it has been used in. This is an unreasonable, irresponsible, and wasteful use of taxpayer dollars that should be going towards actual deployable clean energy solutions like PV, wind, enhanced geothermal, and the low hanging fruit of energy efficiency retrofits. Once again, it seems as

though the NRC is more concerned with what a billionaire and a Wyoming senator want than what is actually in the interest of the taxpayer. The financials of this project should be made publicly available on a regular basis so that taxpayers can clearly understand what their dollars are being spent on and why. It needs to also be explained why the NRC would consider licensing construction of this plant when at best this will not be built for another 7 to 10 years. That is too late to make any meaningful impact of climate change and de-carbonization of power production. The public should know how the federal government is justifying this boondoggle project in the midst of the climate crisis that is killing people right now.

The NRC should also consider the lack of long term storage of spent nuclear fuels. There is currently no deep geologic permanent repository for spent nuclear fuel and other high level nuclear waste. It is reckless and shows not only hubris, but arrogance to think that storing this waste on-site is reasonable or safe over the long term. This is especially true of spent fuel that will be produced by this reactor. If I understand it correctly, this reactor will produce plutonium as a byproduct. This substance is one of the most deadly substances known to humans and creates a very real and concerning nuclear non-proliferation problem. Recent political instability and violent terrorist attacks from right-wing extremists have shown that there is a risk of these materials falling into the hands of bad actors. Until there is a permanent deep geologic repository new nuclear plants should not be built. Please explain, this situation and why the NRC would consider allowing this kind of waste to be produced without a safe permanent place to store it. Please specifically address vulnerabilities with on-site storage, including risks of political destabilization, states such as Wyoming going rogue or engaging in insurrection or going bankrupt. Additionally, please address if Wyoming or nearby states are being considered by the company or DOE to store waste from this or any other reactor. Storing spent fuel in Wyoming as a “dump it and forget it” strategy is unacceptable.

As mentioned above this reactor is proposed to use specialized HALEU fuel. This fuel will be made from uranium mined, milled, enriched and processed. These processes are extremely dirty, dangerous and continue to poison the air and water of communities around the western United States and the world where these activities take place. Please review and disclose all impacts associated with uranium mining, milling, processing, and the production of HALEU fuel for the proposed power plant. Please also disclose what kind of bonding requirements will be put in place to ensure these site do not become more superfund sites or sacrifice areas.

The relationships between the Rocky Mountain Power, TerraPower, and the DOE are of interest to ratepayers and tax payers. Please explain the relationship between Rocky Mountain Power and TerraPower and disclose any anticipated ratepayer impacts that will result from the project, such as higher utility bills or long-term debt financing, costs of maintaining the facility, and any cost associated with accidents. Please also evaluate and discuss the truthfulness in the proposals, advertising, and include disclosures of the amounts of money spent by these companies on lobbying, advertising, and other public relations related to this project.

Please explain how this plant will be insured. Who will be insuring this plant against disaster and for how much? Is there an implied or explicit government insuring of this plant? How will people impacted by a nuclear or industrial disaster be compensated?

Please also explain why this experimental reactor is to be built in Wyoming instead of at INL in Idaho where other experimental reactors are located and the environment already degraded? Please explain the impacts and costs of having multiple INL/DOE sites, instead of keeping things in Idaho, where the expertise and staff already exist.

Please explain what the evacuation plans would be for local residents and people downwind. What will the protocol for ensuring the public is kept aware of any incidents and given immediate notification to evacuate. Please evaluate if an evacuation is even feasible and under what circumstances.

Please consider a full range of alternatives to the proposed nuclear power plant in your EIS, including the much lower-cost and readily available renewable energy options such as PV, wind, and enhanced geothermal.

Finally, please explain how this plant will impact the community. Our rural towns have been predated on by companies and politicians that weaponize hope for a better economy, jobs, and a livelihood that often doesn't materialize with proposed projects like this one. Will violent crime, rape, and drug use increase like it did in Bakken? What will the actual economic impacts be? Our communities deserve a clear eyed view of what to expect and to not have the NRC let the fox into the henhouse to pillage.

Thank You,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ryan C. Sedgeley". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping initial "R".

Ryan Sedgeley