

(12)

**PRM-51-10
(71FR64169)**

From: Meghan O'Rourke <morourke@cctv.org>
To: <SECY@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Jan 15, 2007 11:10 AM
Subject: Comment regarding Massachusetts Attorney General's Petition for Rulemaking to Amend 10 CFR Part, Docket No. PRM-51-10

Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

ATTN: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff.

Subject: Comment regarding Massachusetts Attorney General's Petition for Rulemaking to Amend 10 CFR Part
Docket No. PRM-51-10
FR Doc. E6-18363 Filed 10-31-06; 8:45 am
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

DOCKETED
USNRC

January 16, 2007 (3:17pm)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

January 15th, 2007

I support the Massachusetts Attorney General's petition for rulemaking to rescind the NRC's finding that environmental impacts of spent reactor fuel pool storage are insignificant. We agree with the petitioners request that the NRC Commission:

(a) consider new and significant information showing that NRC's characterization of the environmental impacts of spent fuel storage as insignificant in the 1996 Generic Environmental Impact Statement for Renewal of Nuclear Power Plant Licenses is incorrect,

(b) revoke regulations codifying the incorrect conclusion eliminating consideration of spent fuel storage impacts in NEPA decision-making documents,

(c) issue a generic determination that the environmental impacts of high-density spent fuel pool storage are significant, and

(d) order that any NRC licensing decision that approves high-density spent fuel pool storage at a nuclear power reactor or other facility must require the creation of an environmental impact statement ("EIS") addressing (i) the environmental impacts of high density pool storage of spent fuel at that nuclear reactor and (ii) provide a reasonable array of alternatives for avoiding or mitigating those impacts.

Massachusetts Attorney General's Petition meets the standard for Rulemaking Petitions. NRC regulation 10 C.F.R. § 2.802(a) provides that "[a]ny interested person may petition the Commission to issue, amend or rescind any regulation." The regulations require that the petitioner describes specific issues involved, views or arguments with respect to those issues, relevant technical, scientific or other data involved which is reasonably available to the petitioner, and other pertinent information that the petitioner deems necessary to support the action sought. 10 C.F.R. § 2.802(c)(3). The Massachusetts AG s meets this standard.

The rule also requires that the petitioner "should note any specific cases of which petitioner is aware where the current rule is unduly burdensome, deficient, or needs to be strengthened." The AG has met this

Template=SECY-067

SECY-02

requirement as well. The AG requests the revocation of 10 C.F.R. §§ 51.53(c)(2) and 51.95(c) and Table B-1 of Appendix A to 10 C.F.R. Part 51 to ensure NEPA compliance in the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee license renewal cases if the ASLB or the Commission interprets those regulations to bar the consideration of significant new information presented by the Attorney General's contentions regarding the environmental impacts of high-density pool storage of spent fuel. CAN supports this revocation.

Thank you very much for your consideration,

--

Meghan O'Rourke
Channel 17/CCTV
At The Center for Media and Democracy
294 North Winooski Avenue
Burlington, VT 05401
morourke@cctv.org

I find television very educating. Every time somebody turns on the set, I go into the other room and read a book.

Groucho Marx (1890 - 1977)

Mail Envelope Properties (45ABA751.4E7 : 6 : 1255)

Subject: Comment regarding Massachusetts Attorney General's Petition for Rulemaking to Amend 10 CFR Part,Docket No. PRM-51-10
Creation Date Mon, Jan 15, 2007 11:09 AM
From: Meghan O'Rourke <morourke@cctv.org>

Created By: morourke@cctv.org

Recipients

nrc.gov

TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
SECY (SECY)

Post Office

TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3292	Monday, January 15, 2007 11:09 AM
Mime.822	4783	

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
ReplyRequested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered

Junk Mail handling disabled by User
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator
Junk List is not enabled
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled
Block List is not enabled