

**From:** [Stacy Schumann](#)  
**To:** [Julie Ruth](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Palisades nuclear power plant  
**Date:** Monday, July 29, 2024 1:53:30 PM

---

Good afternoon,

Thank you for your comment regarding the *Federal Register* notice, “**Holtec Decommissioning International, LLC, and Holtec Palisades, LLC; Palisades Nuclear Plant; Notice of Intent To Conduct Scoping Process and Prepare an Environmental Assessment,**” ([89 FR 53659](#)). Your comment will be processed and available for public viewing on Regulations.gov in 10 business days ([NRC-2024-0076](#)).

Thank you!

Kind regards,  
-Stacy

*Regulations Specialist  
Legal Research Center  
Office of the General Counsel  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
OWFN/15-LRC; Phone: (301) 415-0624*

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

Comment (97)  
Publication Date:6/27/2024  
Citation: 89 FR 53659

---

**From:** Julie Ruth <juliescheidler25@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 29, 2024 11:04 AM  
**To:** Stacy Schumann <Stacy.Schumann@nrc.gov>  
**Subject:** [External\_Sender] Palisades nuclear power plant

Dear Ms. Schumann and others-

My grandparents bought a cottage in Palisades Park back in 1978 so that our family could gather together and create memories. Our family is 192 strong. I tell you this because it matters. There are 192 people behind this email asking you to NOT let Holtec reopen the Palisade’s Nuclear Power Plant.

My grandmother is 94 and is so excited to go up to Palisades in August. Our family has spent the last 46 summers gathering together from several different states and the most popular weeks are the weeks when “everyone” is there. We could choose weeks where there are less people but we CHOOSE to be together to create lasting memories.

Please understand that we’ve lived with the power plant for many summers, as it was active during several of our summers there. However, being an active, highly regulated

power plant that undergoes rigorous tests and standards is very different than what Holtec is trying to do now. Holtec's requested restart license present environmental risks and unknowns greater than an operating plant that seeks an extension of an existing license. For years, PNP's operator ran the plant knowing it was on a schedule to shut down permanently. PNP's operator deferred maintenance and investment based on this timeline. Simply stated, it operated the plant as a short-timer, not as if it would need to be on line through 2031, the expiration date of its then[1]existing license. The NRC granted waivers for safety upgrades that otherwise would have been required but for the imminent shut down. An additional risk here is the requested issuance of a new license to an entity that has never operated a nuclear power plant. If the EPA mandates a rigorous EIS when determining whether an operating plant with an experienced licensee and ongoing investment and NRC oversight should be allowed to continue operating beyond its license term, shouldn't the EPA – and the NRC and DOE – require at least an EIS when a plant that has been shut down and not subject to the same level of review as an operating plant seeks to restart? Holtec's request presents to the NRC and DOE an important and novel environmental impact question: can this plant, with its history of financial distress, aging infrastructure, deferred maintenance, and degradation from being out of operation, be restarted and operated safely without causing unacceptable risk to the immediate community, environment and the cherished resources of the Great Lakes? Answering this question requires the highest level of environmental review – an EIS that is directed to the unique circumstances of this plant and the unprecedented request before the NRC to restart a permanently shut down nuclear facility.

I ask you to thoughtfully consider and I thank you, we thank you, for doing so.

Sincerely,

Julia Ruth and the 191 members of the O'Brien Family