



TOWN OF PLYMOUTH

11 Lincoln Street
Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360

FAX: (508) 830-4140

Board of Selectmen
Town Manager
(508) 747-1620 ext. 100

Human Resources
(508) 747-1620 ext. 101

February 9, 2016

U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Nuclear Energy
Response to IPC
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

To Whom It May Concern:

The Town of Plymouth, Massachusetts, the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station host community since 1972, is pleased to provide the Department of Energy with feedback to the five questions posed in the Invitation for Public Comment (IPC) published in the Federal Register on December 23, 2015.

The Town of Plymouth fully supports the concept of a consent-based siting process to manage the transportation, storage, and disposal of commercial spent nuclear fuel and high level defense radioactive wastes. The Town of Plymouth supports a truly consent-based process because this approach does not ignore the realities and experiences of the several dozen communities across the country which, like Plymouth, are currently burdened with spent fuel storage facilities.

Please find the Town of Plymouth's feedback below:

1. How can the Department of Energy ensure that the process for selecting a site is fair?

A truly fair process for an integrated waste management system must account for the status quo of nuclear waste storage in the United States by providing relief or certainty to the communities across the country that have become de facto spent fuel repositories. The alternative, a process that only focuses on consent for the future of spent fuel storage, would reinforce the existing impression that the nation's nuclear policy has left these "pre-consent" communities by the wayside.

This is especially true in the case of nuclear power plant closure, which have increased in frequency since 2013. Such instances leave a host community without the socioeconomic benefits of a major employer and taxpayer, while



simultaneously burdening it with dry cask storage installations. While the DOE has a framework in place to compensate licensees and operators for the construction and maintenance of such ISFSI-only sites, the communities that host these sites are left out of the equation. Attempts to stabilize local revenues by levying a property tax on the spent fuel facility have proven unsuccessful, and have resulted in expensive legal proceedings between licensees and municipalities. The result is an open-ended, non-consensual liability that frustrates local socioeconomic growth and redevelopment.

2. What models and experience should the Department of Energy use in designing the process?

We believe that the DOE should build on the experiences of the Department of Defense's Base Realignment and Closure Commission (BRAC), which has a history of interagency cooperation relevant to the consent-based process at hand. The BRAC process not only provides the necessary technical support services to affected communities through the department's Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA), it recognizes that actions causing community growth, whether short-term or long-term, also need to be adequately planned for. For the communities experiencing the removal of spent fuel, and the communities experiencing the development of the long-term repository, managing the changes will require sustained support from federal and state levels.

3. Who should be involved in the process for selecting a site, and what is their role?

The DOE should recognize communities with ISFSIs and other storage installations as existing interim sites. The DOE should consult with representatives of those communities to broker agreements on the continuation of spent fuel storage in a manner that conforms to local and state land use policy and legislation.

4. What information and resources do you think would facilitate your participation?

Engaging with organizations that serve the interests of communities affected by the presence of spent fuel would ensure sustained participation from many existing nuclear host communities. The National Association of Development Organizations (NADO), the National Association of Counties (NACo), and the International Economic Development Council (IEDC) serve the interests of many of these communities, and have established local, regional, state, and federal partnerships that serve local interests.

5. What else should be considered?

The DOE should consider revising its "oldest fuel first" policy for the acceptance of spent nuclear fuel to allow for the prioritization of fuel from commercial reactor sites that have been permanently shut down. This would enable communities that have lost the socioeconomic benefits of an operational reactor to more quickly return the entire site to unrestricted use, and remove a major redevelopment obstacle from the landscape.

The Town of Plymouth welcomes the opportunity to work collaboratively with DOE throughout this process. If there are any questions related to the feedback, provided above, please do not hesitate to contact the Town Manager's Office at 508-747-1620, ext. 100.

Sincerely,



Kenneth Tavares, Chair
Plymouth Board of Selectmen

C: Senator Elizabeth Warren
Senator Edward Markey
Congressman William Keating
Massachusetts Governor Charlie Baker
Attorney General Maura Healey
Senator Viriato deMacedo
Representative Mathew Muratore
Representative Thomas Calter
Representative Randy Hunt