



OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
STATE HOUSE • BOSTON, MA 02133
(617) 725-4000

DEVAL L. PATRICK
GOVERNOR

TIMOTHY P. MURRAY
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

April 6, 2011

Chairman Gregory B. Jackzo
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
One White Flint North
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852-2738

Dear Chairman Jackzo:

As referenced in our previous letter of April 6, 2011, please see the attached questions from Massachusetts's legislative leaders. We look forward to your response. Again, thank you for your time and attention to these concerns.

Sincerely,

A large, stylized handwritten signature of Deval Patrick, written in black ink.

Deval Patrick
Governor

A handwritten signature of Therese Murray, written in black ink.

Therese Murray
Senate President

A handwritten signature of Robert DeLeo, written in black ink.

Robert DeLeo
Speaker

Enc.

Questions:

1. Are there any plans for relocation of the spent nuclear material currently held at the plants, which are over-capacity? Will dry storage be considered? Why is dry storage not the preferred method considering its 'passive' maintenance requirement?
2. Will the NRC and DOE consider seeking changes to the law if necessary to allow for the use of the Nuclear Waste Fund for accelerated dry cask storage and or the licensing of an interim national repository?
3. Are there any plans for future spent nuclear material?
4. For how long does the NRC anticipate that spent fuel will be stored on-site at Pilgrim? What about the other New England facilities?
5. Are there plans for storing spent fuel generated by any of the New England plants off-site?
6. Current understanding is that all the spent material is in the upper levels of the Pilgrim plant and is very susceptible to an aerial attack; are their plans to strengthen/protect the structure from air or relocate the wet pool to a different, more secure location?
7. Japan reprocesses and reuses spent nuclear material, what are the pros and cons of this approach and are there any plans to implement it in the US?
8. The cables powering the Pilgrim plant are not made for a moist environment, though they have spent 40 years in such a situation; what inspection/repair/replacement system is in place to ensure the cables remain in working condition?
9. Will the NRC allow independent experts with security authorization to see studies they used to conclude further on-site spent material storage was safe?
10. Will the NRC provide access to documents it previously has refused to disclose regarding its analysis of the safety and security of our commercial nuclear reactors and spent fuel pools?
11. Pressure build-ups can cause explosions in the Mach 1 core design as was seen in Japan, what adjustments have been made to Seabrook and Vermont Yankee to deal with this design flaw? Germany uses a steam release which is then filtered, is this the best option?
12. What emergency planning adjustments will be made?

13. Is the 10 mile evacuation zone still accurate? Americans were recommended to evacuate any area within 50 miles of the Fukushima plant.
14. Any plans for dealing with people on Cape Cod in an emergency situation considering the prevailing winds travel in that direction?
15. Any potassium iodine pill stockpiling precautions planned?
16. Current evacuation reception centers can only deal with 20% of the intended population, are there plans for more/larger centers?
17. Are there any plans to ensure emergency workers have the proper equipment and communication devices (i.e. interoperable radios)?
18. Are there any plans to install air radiation monitors around plants to more accurately identify radiation plume direction in the case of a release? What about meteorological monitors?
19. What is the purpose of the President's 90 day review of our commercial facilities? Will there be an opportunity for the public or interested states to provide input?
20. With no solution to the long-term disposal of spent fuel and in light of the disaster in Japan, will the NRC commit to re-evaluating its current rules and regulations regarding the on-site storage of spent fuel with public input?
21. What assurances can the NRC provide to the Commonwealth that Pilgrim and VT Yankee not just meet current NRC rules and regulations for safety and security but that there are material differences in the way the plans were designed, upgraded and regulated that will reduce the risk of what is happening in Japan, as they are being re-licensed?
22. Can you provide us with an estimated yearly cost to Massachusetts consumers and taxpayers for the current on-site storage of this spent fuel instead of it being stored off-site?