

From: [Alan Blind](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Cc: [Justin Poole \(He/Him\)](#); [Jack Giessner \(He/Him\)](#); [Jeff Whited](#); [Ngola Otto](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] Petition for Rule-Making: "Licenses, Certifications, and Approvals for Nuclear Power Plants."
Date: Monday, July 01, 2024 2:34:34 PM
Attachments: [Petetion.pdf](#)

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

Attn: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff

E-Mail: RulemakingComments@nrc.gov

Subject: Petition for Rule-making to Amend 10CFRPart 52, "Licenses, Certifications, and Approvals For Nuclear Power Plants"

Dear Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff

Petitioners, Roger Rapoport and Alan Blind, pursuant to 10 CFR § 2.802, "Petition for Rulemaking," are submitting the attached petition to request that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) amend its regulations in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 C.F.R.) Part 52, "Licenses, Certifications, and Approvals for Nuclear Power Plants."

This petition aims to establish an NRC Commission-approved process for returning a decommissioned plant to operating status.

Given the current request for NRC review of Palisades—a plant seeking to return to operational status from decommissioned status—and NRC approval will be binding on our Michigan communities for up to twenty five years, we appreciate your prompt attention to this matter.

Please direct all correspondence to:

Alan Blind
1000 West Shawnee Road
Baroda, Michigan 49101
Email: a.alan.blind

To make it easy for public to find this petition, petitioners request links be provided from the NRC Palisades Potential Restart webpage:

<https://www.nrc.gov/info-finder/reactors/pali.html>

Please acknowledge receipt of this e-mail.

Sincerely,

Roger Rapoport, Alan Blind

Petitioners, Alan Blind and Roger Rapoport are requesting that the Commission modify 10 CFR Part 52, "Licenses, Certifications, and Approvals for Nuclear Power Plants," to include an NRC Commission-approved process for returning a decommissioned plant to operational status. This new rule-making is necessary, as Palisades is the first plant seeking NRC approval to transition from decommissioned status back to operation. The petitioner believes that Palisades represents a unique, "outlier" case that will set a precedent for any future plants making similar requests.

Petitioners are both residents of Southwest Michigan. Roger is a well known author and investigative journalist, and Alan is a retired nuclear power executive.

The single point of contact for petitioners will be:

Alan Blind
1000 West Shawnee Road
Baroda, Michigan 49101
Email: a.alan.blind@gmail.com

The petitioners have standing due to concerns that the NRC staff lacks a specific NRC Commission-approved and codified process for licensing, inspecting, and approving the return to service of a decommissioned plant. This process must consider the unique, fifty-year licensing history of an "outlier" plant like Palisades. Holtec has announced plans to seek another life extension term beyond the current one after the plant returns to operation. Therefore, any decisions and approvals from the NRC regarding the return to service will have long-term implications for local communities, potentially affecting them for up to 25 more years.

The NRC Staff has received a proposal for a regulatory path to the reauthorization of power operations at the Palisades Nuclear Plant, using the current regulatory framework¹. The proposed framework is based entirely on a Denial of a Petition for Rule-making for a 2019 petition, "Criteria to Return Retired Nuclear Power Reactors to Operations"². This petitioner's reading of the 2019 petition denial basis, was in part, and perhaps largely, based on there being no current proposal (2020) to return a plant

¹ ML23072A404, March 2023, "Regulatory Path to Reauthorize Power Operations at the Palisades Nuclear Plant"

² U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission SECY-20-0110, Enclosure 1, Federal Register Notice – Denial of Petition for Rulemaking on Criteria to Return Retired Nuclear Power Reactors to Operations (PRM-50-117; NRC-2019-0063), (ADAMS Accession No. ML20205L307), dated December 7, 2020

in decommission status to operation³. We now (2024) have a specific plant making specific request, Palisades.

Questions and answers, from a public meeting (detailed later in this petition, footnote #17 and #18), leads the petitioner to believe the NRC staff will agree with the proposed Palisades/Holtec regulatory framework. This is concerning to the petitioner because current regulatory thinking is based on the denial of the 2019 petition for rule making that, in this petitioner's plain reading, is taken out of context by Holtec/Palisades and NRC Staff.

In particular concern to this petitioner, using the framework for denial of the 2019 petition, Palisades/Holtec is proposing the commission use existing rules for evaluating Palisades transition from decommission status to operating status. However, in its denial letter to the 2019 petitioner, NRC limited its "existing regulations" clause by including, "may be used on a case-by-case basis"⁴. Now that the NRC staff has a specific case, using the 2019 Petition Denial alone, how are NRC staff reviewers to know which "cases" the 2020 Commission meant? Who decides, "case-by-case basis"? This 2024 petitioner requests these important "case" decisions be made by the full NRC Commissioners via new rule making.

Further, this petitioner has reviewed the "documentary evidence"⁵, Holtec provided in its application for license transfer from Entergy to Holtec, and has concluded the premise of the "documentary evidence" was solely for decommissioning. Had the premise been to transfer a "operating plant's" license, would Holtec's submittal and NRC review of qualifications as per 10CFR50.80, "Transfer of Licenses", been different?

Holtec/Palisades has proposed using the following rules. This petitioner will argue, a "plain reading" of these rules are not applicable for Holtec's stated purpose and/or are not sufficient as follows:

- 10CFR50.90, "Amendment of License or Construction Permit at Request of Holder"

³ ML20205L309, Denial Letter to Mr. George Berka, "...In addition, nuclear industry representatives have expressed minimal interest in the development of a new regulatory process for reauthorizing operation, such that the benefits of the requested rule-making would be highly unlikely to outweigh the costs..."

⁴ ML20205L309, Denial Letter to Mr. George Berka, "The NRC is denying PRM-50-117 because the existing regulatory framework may be used on a case-by-case basis to address the issue raised in the petition."

⁵ ML22178A077, June 24, 2022: Holtec Decommissioning International, LLC (HDI) satisfactory documentary evidence required before the planned closing date of the purchase and sale transaction of Palisades Nuclear Plant and Big Rock Point Plant

- 10CFR50.12, “Specific Exceptions”
- 10CFR50.59, “Changes, tests and experiments”

50.90 applicability states it applies to construction permit, operating license under this part, an early site permit, a combined license, and manufacturing license under part 5 of this chapter: Petitioner’s plain reading is that Plants licensed for decommissioning do not meet the 50.90 applicability.

50.12 applicability, states: (a) The Commission may, upon application by any interested person or upon its own initiative, grant exemptions from the requirements of the regulations of this part, which are-- (1) Authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety, and are consistent with the common defense and security. (2) The Commission will not consider granting an exemption unless special circumstances are present. Special circumstances are present whenever—

Petitioner’s plain reading review of the 50.90 circumstances found only one which may have been considered by NRC Staff:

(vi) There is present any other material circumstance not considered when the regulation was adopted for which it would be in the public interest to grant an exemption. If such condition relied on exclusively for satisfying paragraph (a)(2) of this section, the exemption may not be granted until the Executive Director for Operations has consulted with the Commission.

If this circumstance were used by NRC staff to determine 50.12 may apply to a request to return a decommissioned plant to operation, the Petitioner does not agree in general, and in particular for Palisades, such a view meets the “it would be in the public interest to grant an exemption’ clause.

This petitioner’s position is the public’s health and safety interest is better served by NRC Commission rule making provide an approved process to return a decommissioned plant to operating status. (Contrary to the 2020 petition that argues public interest is served by “simply allowing plants to restart”)⁶

50.59 Applicability: “(a) Definitions for the purposes of this section”, all reference “...FSAR (as updated) used in establishing the design bases or in the safety analyses means...”. Petitioner’s plain reading position is because the operating FSAR was surrendered by Entergy when it surrendered the operating license, there is no “FSAR (as updated)” for Holtec/Palisades to reference

⁶ “The above - proposed change would allow recently shuttered plants, such as Kewaunee, Vermont Yankee, San Onofre, Crystal River, and others, to be permitted to simply re-start, should their owners decide to pursue this approach.”

(emphasis on “as updated”). This petitioner believes NRC review of the new FSAR will be a very complex question and how to do this is best left to the full NRC commission, via new rule making, to resolve.

Following the current Commission’s process for rule making will ensure the extremely complex issue of returning Palisades to operation has been well thought out, including public and NRC full commission involvement. NRC Staff then can use the new codified process to implement the restart safely. The petitioner is not qualified to provide wording for the proposed rule. Rather the petitioner has full confidence in the NRC Commission process⁷ for rule making and requests the commission direct the staff, with public input, to draft the proposed rule. The new rule should include, but not limited, to the following elements:

- Decommissioning Status and Configuration Verification
- Aging Management*
- Quality Assurance During Restart and Operations*
- Equipment Maintenance*
- Personnel Qualifications*
- License Expiration*
- Hearing Process*
- Appropriate Licensing Basis*
- Start Up Testing
- NRC Catchup Review, and Completion of Past, Open Commitments
- Need for An Updated 10CFR.52 submittal, “Transfer of Licenses”

** NRC Identified Rule Elements: Criteria to Return Retired Nuclear Power Reactors to Operations⁸*

Petitioner is concerned that Palisades license/design basis, at the time of shutdown, had unique characteristics that make NRC review and acceptance for return to service more complicated than any other currently operating or eligible decommissioned plant.

⁷ The NRC Rule Making Process: <https://www.nrc.gov/about-nrc/regulatory/rulemaking/rulemaking-process.html>

⁸ Docket No. PRM-50-117; NRC-2019-0063, Criteria to Return Retired Nuclear Power Reactors to Operations, February, 2019

Palisades is a unique, outlier example. Its not hard to imagine, over the last fifty years, the NRC staff, when preparing documents referenced below, could not have imagined the complex nature of a Palisades restart as we have in 2024, and request for a second life extension term. Examples that make Palisades unique include:

- At the time of its last shutdown, Palisades was one of three remaining Systematic Evaluation Process⁹, SEP, plants in operation¹⁰. Palisades was constructed prior to 10CFR Part 50 and General Design Criteria. The SEP was initiated by the NRC to review the design of older operating nuclear reactor plants to reconfirm and document their safety¹¹. The NRC granted exceptions to design criteria that could not be met or were accepted on “another defined basis”, and were determined, fifty years earlier (1984), to be an acceptable safety risk¹¹.

Over the fifty years since the SEP was completed there have been important industry events and lessons learned that must be considered in today’s light. The SEP authors anticipated such a case. From the NUREG 0820 SEP report, dated November, 1983:

“Because of the evolutionary nature of the licensing requirements discussed above and the developments in technology over the years, operating nuclear power plants embody a broad spectrum of design features and requirements depending on when the plant was constructed, who was the manufacturer, and when it was licensed for operation. The amount of documentation that defines these safety-design characteristics also has changed with the age of the plant--the older the plant, the less documentation and potentially the greater the difference from current licensing criteria.”

- After announcing its first of two commitments to shutdown Palisades, Entergy notified NRC it was withdrawing its open comments for resolving safety issues, and the withdrawal was accepted by the NRC. In doing so, in 2017, seven years ago, NRC reviewers were re-assigned to other NRC tasks. This petitioner is

⁹ NUREG 0820, Integrated Plant Assessment Program For Palisades, October 1982

¹⁰ SEP Plants: Yankee, Haddam Neck, Millstone 1, Oyster Creek, Ginna, LaCrosse, Big Rock Point, Palisades, Dresden 1, Dresden 2, San Onofre

¹¹ INTEGRATED PLANT SAFETY ASSESSMENT REPORT SUPPLEMENT No 1, Section One: “...Of the original 137 topics, 90 were, therefore, reviewed for Palisades; of these, 59 met current c r i t e r i a or were acceptable on another defined basis. The review of the 31 remaining topics found that certain aspects of plant design differed from current criteria...”

concerned, lacking new rules for return to operation status, how will the lost seven years of NRC reviews of prior commitments and safety issues be regained? Safety Issues with withdrawn commitments include, but may not be limited to:

- A. GSI-191, Containment Recirculation Sump Blockage¹²
 - B. Appendix R/NFPA-805, Fire Protection¹³
 - C. Beyond-Design Basis Seismic Hazard Re-Evaluations¹⁴
- The current Quality Assurance Program only includes SSEs for a plant in decommissioning¹⁵. The operating QAPD was surrendered, by Entergy, to the NRC. This petitioner is concerned, lacking new rules, how the current safety related SSEs have been preserved? How will the NRC confirm? This petitioner's position is the public's health and safety interest is better served by NRC Commission rule making provide an approved process to return a decommissioned plant to operating status.
 - Palisades no longer has a Final Safety Analysis Report for operations. The approved FSAR was surrendered, by Entergy, to the NRC. How will NRC inspections be performed if there is no FSAR/Design Basis? This petitioner is concerned, given the 50 years of industry events and lessons learned, should the NRC again agree to a licensing basis with so many exceptions to past and current General Design Criteria? This petitioner's position is the public's health and safety interest is better served by NRC Commission rule making provide an approved process to return a decommissioned plant to operating status.

¹² M19246B981, Notice to Cancel Commitments, September, 2019

¹³ ML18039A244, NFPA-805 Request To Change Commitments, February, 2018

¹⁴ ML19115A413, REQUEST FOR DEFERRAL OF ACTIONS RELATED TO BEYOND-DESIGN-BASIS SEISMIC HAZARD REEVALUATIONS, May, 2019

¹⁵ June 13, 2014 Ngola Otto: **Question:** Have the follow-up discussion on the Holtec QA program been held? If so, what were the results?

Response: The follow-up discussions occurred during a pre-submittal public meeting on May 6, 2024. During that meeting, Holtec stated that they would supplement the license transfer amendment with a new operational quality assurance program to support QA activities for an operational plant. On May 23, 2024, the supplement to provide the new operational quality assurance program was submitted by Holtec. With regards to a program that supports QA activities occurring during the restart activities, during the public meeting, Holtec stated that the decommissioning QA plan will be updated to add the proper QA requirements.

Holtec has made submittals to the NRC to return Palisades to Operation after its previous owner, Entergy completed all necessary steps (50.82, “Termination of license,” and 52.110, “Termination of license,) to surrender the license¹⁶. Holtec has proposed a process for return to service and how it proposes to prepare the new FSAR and design/licensing basis:

“While NRC regulations do not prescribe a specific regulatory path for reinstating operational authority following docketing of the 50.82(a)(1) certifications, the NRC has recognized that its existing regulatory framework—namely the process of reviewing and approving exemption and license amendment requests prescribed by 10 CFR 50.12 and 50.90—provides adequate flexibility to accommodate reauthorization of operations”.

In response to questions¹⁷ submitted to NRC staff regarding Holtec’s StartUp Plan letter, concerning the basis for Holtec’s statement about using current processes, NRC Staff seemed to accept Holtec’s proposal¹⁸, In responding to public meeting questions,

¹⁶ ML23072A404, Regulatory Path to Reauthorize Power Operations at the Palisades Nuclear Plant, March 2013

¹⁷ June 13, 2014 Ngola Otto: **Question:** The above, Holtec’s letter, concerning the NRC process to be used for evaluation of Palisades restart, is a Holtec position. Does NRC agree? Given the lack of a codified NRC process, should this process be codified and approved by the NRC commissioners?

Response: A petition for rule-making had been submitted to codify the process a licensee would need to follow to restart a plant that had previously entered a decommissioning state but was denied by the NRC. In its ruling, the Commissions stated that “the existing regulatory framework may be used to address the issue raised” in the petition and that “the NRC may consider requests from licensees to resume operations under the existing regulatory framework.” For Palisades, the NRC staff is reviewing applications from the licensee that fall within existing regulatory processes, such as license amendments and exemption requests.

¹⁸ June 13, 2014 Ngola Otto: **Question:** May Holtec use the 10 CFR 50.59 process to review the acceptability of a new FSAR? How can there be a no unreviewed safety question determination, against a design basis that no longer exists? It seems the correct approach is for the NRC staff, to review the new FSAR in its entirety, for acceptance.

Response: Holtec has stated in its license amendment requests that it will restore the FSAR to the revision that was in effect just prior to the plant shutting down. The NRC is reviewing the applications to restore the technical specifications and the operating license to that which existed just prior to the plant shutting down, as a basis for our review. Our review will focus on changes from what had previously been found acceptable for operation.

NRC's NRR staff referenced a 2019 Petition For Rule Making, which was denied¹⁹, as the basis for giving consideration to Holtec's licensing / design basis process. The 2019 petition said:

"The petitioner requested that the NRC allow the owner or operator of a nuclear power reactor a fair, reasonable, and unobstructed opportunity to return a retired facility to full operational status, even if the operating license for the facility had previously been surrendered"

In the Commission's 2020 response for denying the 2019 Petition, the following basis were given:

- the existing regulatory framework may be used on a case-by-case basis to address the issue raised by the petitioner
- the nuclear industry has not expressed a strong interest in returning retired plants to operational status and proceeding with rule-making to develop a new regulatory framework that may not be used is not a prudent use of resources
- this issue would entail a significant expenditure of NRC resources. Any such rule-making effort would likely address a wide variety of technical and regulatory topics including, but not limited to, decommissioning status, aging management, quality assurance, equipment maintenance, personnel, license expiration, hearing process, and appropriate licensing basis

It appears to the petitioner's plain reading, the NRC Commission's denial of the 2019 petition does not support the current (2024) NRC position that existing (current) process, in all cases, provides adequate direction for returning a plant from decommissioned status to operation. The denial clearly says, "...on a case-by-case basis...".

In fact, it appears to the petitioner's plain reading, the NRC's denial of the 2019 petitioner, supports the current petitioner's 2024 request, based on:

More than another plant, Palisades has a unique licensing basis, and considering how to integrate all of the issues into a coherent start up and NRC approval plan, that ensures transparency and public safety, goes well beyond current regulations and falls outside the "case by case" exceptions basis statement in the 2020 petition denial

¹⁹ Docket No. PRM-50-117; NRC-2019-0063, Criteria to Return Retired Nuclear Power Reactors to Operations, February, 2019

response. From the Commission's own prior analysis, when it was considering a much easier set of conditions for the 2019 petition²⁰:

"Based on the complexity of the issue raised by the petitioner, a rule making on this issue would entail a significant expenditure of NRC resources. Any such rule-making effort would likely address a wide variety of technical and regulatory topics including, but not limited to, decommissioning status, aging management, quality assurance, equipment maintenance, personnel, license expiration, hearing process, and appropriate licensing basis."

And, to add to the complexity are the comments from the SEP report, NUREG 0820", who we cannot know if the previous NRC staff considered Palisades, fifty years later, would be relicensed for two additional Life Extension periods, using a fifty year old design basis. Again, from the SEP;

"...Because of the evolutionary nature of the licensing requirements discussed above and the developments in technology over the years, operating nuclear power plants embody a broad spectrum of design features and requirements depending on when the plant was constructed, who was the manufacturer, and when it was licensed for operation."

In closing, the petitioner argues that returning a decommissioned plant to operation does not meet the applicability requirements of 10CFR 50.59, 10CFR 50.90, and 10CFR 50.12, as proposed by Holtec/Palisades. Using the NRC's own analysis, the steps necessary to allow decommissioned plants like Palisades to return to service are "very complex and require a thoughtful, integrated approach." Therefore, the petitioners requests the Commission modify 10 CFR Part 52 to include an NRC Commission-approved rule for returning a decommissioned plant to operating status, with particular consideration given to Palisades, given its unique circumstances and submitted restart plan.

Moreover, upon reviewing the documentary evidence that Holtec submitted in its application to transfer the Palisades license from Entergy to Holtec, the petitioner's view is the evidence was provided solely for decommissioning purposes. The petitioner is requesting that rule-making require NRC staff to review all materials associated with license transfers to new entities for decommissioning. Should there be a request to resume operations, the petitioner requests that entities previously approved for decommissioning be required to submit a new license transfer application in accordance with 10CFR 50.80, "Transfer of Licenses." This requirement will ensure that the NRC assesses the qualifications of the requesting entity based on evidence of its operational capabilities, not evidence of its decommissioning qualifications.

²⁰ Docket No. PRM-50-117; NRC-2019-0063, Criteria to Return Retired Nuclear Power Reactors to Operations, February, 2019

[This page intentionally left blank.]

From: [Alan Blind](#)
To: [Rulemaking Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] Re: Request submitted July 1, 2024; NRC Acknowledgement of Receipt; RE: Petition for Rule-Making: "Licenses, Certifications, and Approvals for Nuclear Power Plants."
Date: Sunday, July 7, 2024 9:55:30 PM
Attachments: [Petition Signatures Redacted\(.pdf\)](#)

Cindy

This is a follow-up to my request to add support signatures. I was able to reduce the file size to an acceptable size for email.

I've attached the supporting signatures pdf file.

Alan Blind

On Sun, Jul 7, 2024 at 9:20 PM Alan Blind <a.alan.blind@gmail.com> wrote:

Cindy

After Roger and I submitted the above petition, 157 community members near Palisades signed, documenting their support for it.

"We, the below signed support the petition submitted by Roger Rapoport and Alan Blind requesting the NRC amend its regulation in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulation codifying safety standards in the industry."

These signatories live in Palisades Park, directly next to the Palisades Owner-Controlled Area, and have standing, the same as petitioners Roger Rapoport and myself, Alan Blind.

Due to its size, 32MB, the PDF file is [Google Drive Link to download the file](#). I hope this is OK. Otherwise, please provide a postal address I can send the paper copy to.

Personal information (street address) has been redacted. Please let me know if the NRC needs to see the unredacted version.



Petition Signatures Redacted.pdf

Alan Blind and Roger Rapoport

On Mon, Jul 1, 2024 at 4:09 PM Rulemaking Resource <Rulemaking.Resource@nrc.gov> wrote:

Dear Alan Blind (a.alan.blind@gmail.com):

This email is in reference to your request dated July 1, 2024, that you filed electronically with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). The NRC staff is currently evaluating your request to determine if it meets the NRC's requirements in § 2.802 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, "Petition for rulemaking – requirements for filing," for docketing of a petition for rulemaking. You will be notified once the NRC's staff has completed its docketing evaluation.

You may direct any questions you may have concerning the petition process or the status of your request to me at Cindy.Bladey@nrc.gov (phone: 301-415-3280).

Regards,

Cindy Bladey, Chief

Regulatory Analysis and Rulemaking Support Branch

Division of Rulemaking, Environmental, and Financial Support

Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards

We, the below signed support the petition submitted by Roger Rapoport and Alan Blind requesting the NRC
mend its regulations in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations codifying safety standards in the industry.

Printed Name	Address	Signature
TOM FLYNN	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Karen Davis	[REDACTED]	K. Davis
DILLON REED	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Jim Tillson	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Bruce Davis	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
GENE WARNER	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Thomas Beck	[REDACTED]	Capt. Mr. Thomas Beck
JOEY FLYNN	[REDACTED]	Covert MI [Signature]
Jon Schulte	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
John Heisel	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Peggy Sutton	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Mary Dolores Diklerin	[REDACTED]	Covert MI
Salvatore Hingich	[REDACTED]	
Lauren VanderBerg	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Josh VanderBerg	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Walt Oberhen	[REDACTED]	Walt Oberhen
Jeff Melillo	[REDACTED]	Covert M
Rebecca Halpin	[REDACTED]	
Laura Strehlow	[REDACTED]	Covert
KATHERINE G. THOMPSON	[REDACTED]	Covert 49043
Julee Janet Frego	[REDACTED]	Covert 49043
Kathleen Kim Snider	[REDACTED]	Covert 49043

We, the below signed support the petition submitted by Roger Rapoport and Alan Blind requesting the NRC
mend its regulations in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations codifying safety standards in the industry.

Printed Name	Address	Signature
TOM FLYNN	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Karen Davis	[REDACTED]	K. Davis
DILLON REED	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Jim Tillson	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Bruce DAVIS	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
GENE WARNER	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Thomas Beck	[REDACTED]	Carl M. Thomas Beck
JOBY FLYNN	[REDACTED]	Covert MI [Signature]
Jon Schulte	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
John Heisel	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Peggy Sutton	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Mary Dolores Dalkin	[REDACTED]	Covert MI
Salvatore Hengal	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Lauren VanderBerg	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Josh VanderBerg	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Walt Oberken	[REDACTED]	Walt Oberken
Jeff Melvick	[REDACTED]	Covert M
Alex Halpin	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
Laura Strehlow	[REDACTED]	[Signature]
KATHERY G. THOMPSON	[REDACTED]	Covert 49043
Julee Janet Frego	[REDACTED]	Covert 49043
Kathleen Kim Snider	[REDACTED]	Covert 49043

We, the below signed support the petition submitted by Roger Rapoport and Alan Blind requesting the NRC amend its regulations in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations codifying safety standards in the industry.

Printed Name	Address	Signature
John Kleb	[REDACTED]	Covert MI [Signature]
DAVID SIMONLU	[REDACTED]	COVERT MI [Signature]
Martha Murray	[REDACTED]	Covert MI Martha Murray [Signature]
Rhett Murray	[REDACTED]	Covert MI Rhett Murray [Signature]
Kevin Hohman	[REDACTED]	Covert MI Kevin Hohman [Signature]
Margaret Hohman	[REDACTED]	Covert, MI Margaret Hohman [Signature]
Raymond Lewis	[REDACTED]	Covert MI Raymond Lewis [Signature]
J. W. King	[REDACTED]	Covert, MI J. W. King [Signature]
STEVEN SARACENO	[REDACTED]	Covert Steven Saraceno [Signature]
Judy Hamblin	[REDACTED]	Covert MI Judy Hamblin [Signature]
Susan Whitney	[REDACTED]	Covert MI Susan Whitney [Signature]
Terrence O Brian	[REDACTED]	Covert MI Terrence O Brian [Signature]
Stephen Bates	[REDACTED]	Covert MI Stephen Bates [Signature]
Mary Huffman	[REDACTED]	Covert MI Mary Huffman [Signature]
Mal Stephens	[REDACTED]	Covert MI 49043 Mal Stephens [Signature]
Erin Dougherty Foley	[REDACTED]	Covert MI 49043 Erin Dougherty Foley [Signature]
LEIGH SPEICHER	[REDACTED]	COVERT, MI 49043 Leigh Speicher [Signature]
Adrienne McArdle	[REDACTED]	Covert 49043 Adrienne McArdle [Signature]
Brent Harrison	[REDACTED]	COVERT, MI Brent Harrison [Signature]
John McArdle	[REDACTED]	COVERT, MI 49043 John McArdle [Signature]

We, the below signed support the petition submitted by Roger Rapoport and Alan Blind requesting the NRC
mend its regulations in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations codifying safety standards in the industry.

Printed Name	Address	Signature
Nancy Wintermute	[REDACTED]	Nancy P. Wintermute
Bob Wintermute	[REDACTED]	Bob Wintermute
Erin Ruemmele	[REDACTED]	Erin Ruemmele
JACK GIBBINS	[REDACTED]	JACK GIBBINS
William T. Henry	[REDACTED]	William T. Henry
Bryan Henry	[REDACTED]	Bryan Henry
Tim RICHARD	[REDACTED]	Tim Richard
Nancy ^{or cousin} McCleary	[REDACTED]	Nancy McCleary
Wendy Dancy	[REDACTED]	Wendy Dancy
Sally Breen	[REDACTED]	Sally Breen
Michael G Breen	[REDACTED]	Michael G Breen
Ann Wehrhain	[REDACTED]	Ann Wehrhain
Jackie Sobel	[REDACTED]	Jackie Sobel
Tye Fox	[REDACTED]	Tye Fox
Maureen Sharpe	[REDACTED]	Maureen Sharpe
Cyndy Corbell	[REDACTED]	Cyndy Corbell
Erik Schwinger	[REDACTED]	Erik Schwinger
Alison Schwinger	[REDACTED]	Alison Schwinger
Damon Russell	[REDACTED]	Damon Russell
Giuseppe Nardulli	[REDACTED]	Giuseppe Nardulli
Stephanie Johnson	[REDACTED]	Stephanie Johnson
Juliette Nardulli	[REDACTED]	Juliette Nardulli

We, the below signed support the petition submitted by Roger Rapoport and Alan Blind requesting the NRC
mend its regulations in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations codifying safety standards in the industry.

Printed Name	Address	Signature
Terri Schultz	[REDACTED]	Terri Schultz
Kinda Neal	[REDACTED]	Covert Mrs. Linda Neal
Ann Sylvester	[REDACTED]	Covert Mrs. E. Sylvester
MIKE McMAHON	[REDACTED]	Covert Mr. Mike
Jody Kline	[REDACTED]	Covert Jody Kline
Mary Carol Oberlin	[REDACTED]	Covert Mary Carol Oberlin
Sarah Samuel	[REDACTED]	Covert Sarah Samuel
John MacLander	[REDACTED]	Covert John MacLander
Heather Garrison	[REDACTED]	Covert Heather Garrison
Chris Garrison	[REDACTED]	Covert Chris Garrison
Francis B. Quinn	[REDACTED]	Covert Mr. Francis B. Quinn
Ann Garvey	[REDACTED]	Covert Mrs. Ann Garvey
Kevin Flynn	[REDACTED]	KEVIN Flynn

We, the below signed support the petition submitted by Roger Rapoport and Alan Blind requesting the NRC
mend its regulations in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations codifying safety standards in the industry.

Printed Name

Address

Signature

Molly K. Whansen

[Redacted Address]

Molly K. Whansen

Brookly Thompson

[Redacted Address]

Brookly Thompson

George J. Rehrig

[Redacted Address]

George J. Rehrig

Barbara Eriple

[Redacted Address]

Barbara Eriple

LEE ELLEN KIRK

[Redacted Address]

LEE ELLEN KIRK

Mary Beth Tammen

[Redacted Address]

Mary Beth Tammen

Kara Noorif

[Redacted Address]

Kara Noorif

Dawnon Davis

[Redacted Address]

Dawnon Davis

^{Mrs} Bridget Davis

[Redacted Address]

Bridget Davis

Blank lined area for additional signatures.

We, the below signed support the petition submitted by Roger Rapoport and Alan Blind requesting the NRC mend its regulations in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations codifying safety standards in the industry.

Printed Name

Address

Signature

Andrea Dunkley

[Redacted]

Andrea Dunkley

Leah Flanagan

[Redacted]

Covert, MI

Leah Flanagan

John H. Spencer

[Redacted]

Covert, MI

Dianne M Ebert

[Redacted]

Covert MI

Karen Robbins

[Redacted]

Covert MI 49043

Christen Ryan

[Redacted]

Covert, MI 49043

Benny Eisenbar

[Redacted]

Covert MI 49043

Linda Salas

[Redacted]

49043

Susan Eisenberg

[Redacted]

Covert MI 49043

Douglas Stewart

[Redacted]

D Stewart

Covert MI 49043

Janice King

[Redacted]

Covert, MI 49043

Al J. Jeff

[Redacted]

Covert MI 49043

[Empty lines for additional signatures]

[This page intentionally left blank.]

From: [Alan Blind](#)
To: [Rulemaking Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] Re: Request submitted July 1, 2024; NRC Acknowledgement of Receipt; RE: Petition for Rule-Making: "Licenses, Certifications, and Approvals for Nuclear Power Plants."
Date: Tuesday, July 16, 2024 8:33:42 AM
Attachments: [Specific Exemption Comment.pdf](#)

Cindy

I request the attached comment, made at the July 11 public meeting (Docket ID NRC-2024-0076), in Benton Harbor, Michigan be added to our Petition For Rulemaking.

The comment was read into the public meeting record and provides supporting details for arguments made, in our petition, regarding the use of the Specific Exemption Rule.

Our petition included arguments concerning the Specific Exemption rule, however, after submitting the petition, additional supporting information was found, and is explained in the attached public meeting comment.

Thank-you.

Alan Blind

On Mon, Jul 1, 2024 at 4:09 PM Rulemaking Resource <Rulemaking.Resource@nrc.gov> wrote:

Dear Alan Blind (a.alan.blind@gmail.com):

This email is in reference to your request dated July 1, 2024, that you filed electronically with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). The NRC staff is currently evaluating your request to determine if it meets the NRC's requirements in § 2.802 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, "Petition for rulemaking – requirements for filing," for docketing of a petition for rulemaking. You will be notified once the NRC's staff has completed its docketing evaluation.

You may direct any questions you may have concerning the petition process or the status of your request to me at Cindy.Bladey@nrc.gov (phone: 301-415-3280).

Regards,

Cindy Bladey, Chief

Regulatory Analysis and Rulemaking Support Branch

Division of Rulemaking, Environmental, and Financial Support

Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards

Exemption Rule Comment, July 11

My name is Alan Blind, and I am a resident of Baroda, Michigan. I am speaking on behalf of the residents of Palisades Park in Covert, Michigan.

Governor Whitmer supported continuing operations at Palisades, yet Entergy shut down the plant, surrendered its operating license, and sold it as “junk,” suitable only for decommissioning. These actions should not be easily reversible.

Holtec has proposed exploiting a loophole from a NRC denial letter concerning a 2019 Petition for Rulemaking for a fast and easy way to allow it to reload fuel and operate Palisades.

If allowed, this will permit Holtec and the NRC to evaluate today’s proceedings with very little public involvement under a “fast and simple” process. This process has already been used to allow NRC to agree with Holtec’s “Motion for Secretary Order, denying public hearings”

The petitioner appealed the Holtec proposed order to not allow public hearings; and captured our concern today:

The device of exemption here is being invoked to camouflage the actual nature of the request, which is a license amendment. The exemption being sought would relieve Holtec from adhering to the core regulations the Atomic Energy Act imposes to ensure safe regulation of commercial nuclear power plants in the interest of public health and safety, as well as environmental protection.

Exemptions are for short-duration bypasses of NRC regulations, not for reversing a major licensing event. This request for permission to restart is a major change that requires full-blown ... licensing proceedings."

Back to my comment today, The residents of Palisades Park and I request that the NRC General Counsel approve the current NRC staff interpretation of the Holtec/NRC's use of selected words, in part and in whole, taken out of context from the denial of “PRM-50-117”, dated February 19, 2019.

As a better approach, we request that the NRC agree with our Petition for Rulemaking to include an NRC Commission-approved process for returning a decommissioned plant to operational status.

Thank you.