

United States of America
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Before the Commission

Motion to Hold in Abeyance the Proposed License
Transfer to TMI-2 Solutions, LLC

In the Matter of:)	Docket No. 50-320-LT
GPU Nuclear, Inc., Metropolitan Edison)	
Company, Jersey Central Power & Light)	
Co., Pennsylvania Electric Co., and)	
TMI-2 Solutions, LLC)	March 15, 2021

(Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2)

Dear Ms. Vietti-Cook:

Re: Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2
Transaction
Motion To Hold in Abeyance the Proposed License
Transfer to TMI-2 Solutions, LLC

The United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (“NRC”) received an application filed by GPU Nuclear, Inc., Metropolitan Edison Company, Jersey Central Power and Light Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company (collectively, the First Energy Companies), and TMI-2 Solutions, LLC (together with the First Energy Companies, the Applicants) on November 12, 2019.

The application requested the NRC's approval of the direct transfer of NRC Possession-Only License No. DPR-73 for Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 2 ("TMI-2") from the current holders, the First Energy Companies, to TMI-2 Solutions, LLC, which is an indirect wholly owned subsidiary of Energy Solutions.

On March 26, 2020, the NRC published a Notice in the Federal Register, Re: Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 2; Consideration of Approval of Transfer of License and Conforming Amendment.

The NRC notified the service list on January 14, 2021, of a Short Notice Commission Affirmation Session - Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2. "The Commission Affirmation Session is scheduled for 10:00 A.M., January 15, 2020."

This Motion is to inform the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that the decisions to approve the above stated license transfer on December 18, 2020, and the Order to "terminate the proceeding" on January 15, 2021, are in error. The NRC failed to account, acknowledge or address the failure of Applicants, the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, and the Susquehanna River Basin Commission to comply with the Clean Water Act, Section 401.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has identified the need for state related agencies - including the DEP or SRBC - to review the criteria from the updated Clean Water Act, Section 401, Water Quality Certification at nuclear plants amending and/or extending their licenses.

The NRC staff failed to comply with and enforce the Clean Water Act, Section 401, while performing its review of the TMI-2 license application. The NRC's lapse, together with the DEP and SRBC's negligence, does not meet the legal standard to properly certify the TMI-2 license transfer application.

Moreover, the failure of TMI-2 Solutions, LLC along with GPU Nuclear, Metropolitan Edison, Jersey Central Power & Light and Pennsylvania Electric to include the certification in their application must be corrected, or the omission will render the Clean Water Act, Section 401, Water Quality Certification meaningless, and provide an incentive for other license transfer applicants to repeat this coordinated omission.

The TMI-2 license transfer must be held in abeyance until the First Energy Companies and TMI-2 Solutions provide and submit proof of adherence to the Clean Water Act, Section 401, and receive approval from the agencies charged with its implementation.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Eric J. Epstein, Chairman
Three Mile Island Alert
4100 Hillsdale Road
Harrisburg, PA 17112
epstein@efmr.org
(717)-635-8615

Dated: March 15, 2021.

I. Background.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission's ("Commission" or "the NRC") ignored the adoption of the Environmental Protection Agency's ("EPA") Clean Water Act, Section 401, Certification Rule which became effective on September 11, 2020. By doing so, the NRC's inaction nullifies the license transfer of Three Mile Island Unit -2 from First Energy to TMI-Solutions, LLC. The EPA rule was promulgated three months prior to the license transfer at Three Mile Island Unit-2 ("TMI-2"). The Certification charged statewide, water quality agencies to implement the water quality certification process consistent with the text and structure of the Clean Water Act ("CWA").

The NRC's silence, and FirstEnergy's and TMI-2 Solutions' omission of documentation of compliance with the Clean Water Act, Section 401, is a fatal error. The final rule establishes procedures that promote consistent implementation of CWA Section 401, and regulatory certainty in the federal licensing and permitting process.

II. Argument.

The final EPA rule became effective on September 11, 2020. A license modification and transfer at Three Mile Island Unit-2 cannot occur without a documented waiver or other documentation from the Certifying Authority - either the Department of Environmental Protection ("DEP") or the Susquehanna River Basin Commission ("SRBC") - that Section 401 Certification does not apply to the changes in license conditions at Three Mile Island. The rule was modified to address deficiencies in the nuclear oversight.

1. Legislative history indicates that Congress created the water quality certification requirement to “recognize the responsibility of Federal agencies to protect water quality whenever their activities affect public waterways.” S. Rep. No. 91-351, at 3 (1969). “In the past, these [Federal] licenses and permits have been granted without any assurance that the [water quality] standards will be met or even considered.” *Id.* As an example, the legislative history discusses the Atomic Energy Commission’s failure to consider the impact of thermal pollution on receiving waters when evaluating “site selection, construction, and design or operation of nuclear power plants.” (1)

The DEP and SRBC (2) are well aware that,

The Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 401 governs certification of water quality. Under section 401, any project seeking federal permits or licenses for activities that “may result in any discharge into the navigable waters” must also obtain a water quality certification from a state or interstate authority. Projects that trigger section 401 certification include projects requiring permits for disturbing wetlands, permits under the Rivers and Harbors Act, licenses for hydroelectric power plants, and licenses from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The certification process takes a holistic look at the water quality and the uses of the water where the discharge(s) may occur to ensure that water quality is maintained and that the water can support human, plant, and animal life... if a state denies certification, federal agencies cannot permit such activity. (3)

1 Environmental Protection Agency, P 40, CFR, Part 121, [EPA-HQ-OW-2019-0405; FRL-10009-80-OW] RIN 2040-AF86, Clean Water Act, Section 401 Certification Rule: Environmental Protection Agency: Final rule, p. 36.

2 The Congress of the United States and the legislatures of New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, provide the mechanism to guide water resource management of the Susquehanna River Basin.

3 Harvard Law School, Environmental and Energy Law Program, (October 30, 2019).

The Compact, which went into effect on January 24, 1971, also established the Susquehanna River Basin Commission as the agency to coordinate these water resources. Part of the SRBC’s mission is, “To support the existing and designated uses of all water bodies by achieving water quality that meets or exceeds standards.”

The SRBC Project Review program works with project sponsors to ensure the Commission's regulations are met in order to protect public health and safety. When sponsors fail to seek approval for a change in their “processes”, the Commission can and has taken action.

In December, 2006 Exelon was fined \$640,000 by the Susquehanna River Basin Commission for water violations at Peach Bottom related to water use and power uprates. (SRBC, Docket #, 20061209). Exelon failed to seek the Commission's approval for any change in their processes that required them to increase water usage by 100,000 gallons a day.

Furthermore, states’ roles and obligations were reaffirmed by the United States Supreme Court in 2006.

The Court concluded by observing that “[s]tate certifications under [section] 401 are essential in the scheme to preserve state authority to address the broad range of pollution.” *Id.* This sentence, when read in isolation, has been interpreted as broadening the scope of section 401 to allow certifying authorities to consider potential environmental impacts from a proposed federally licensed or permitted project that have nothing to do with water quality. (4)

4 Environmental Protection Agency, P 40, CFR, Part 121 [EPA-HQ-OW-2019-0405; FRL-10009-80-OW] RIN 2040-AF86 Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification Rule: Environmental Protection Agency: Final rule, p. 36

The Court then stated,

These are the *very reasons* that Congress provided the States with power to enforce ‘any other appropriate requirement of State law,’ 33 U.S.C. 1341(d), by imposing conditions on federal licenses for activities that may result in a discharge.” *Id.* (emphasis added). (5)

The SRBC’s Response (Enclosure), which was copied to legal counsel, is an admission the Susquehanna River Basin Commission is violating its own standards as well as the Clean Water Act, Section 401. The planned discharge of highly contaminated radioactive water into the Susquehanna River is not a *fait accompli* the Congress envisioned, and the SRBC’s silence does not achieve “water quality that meets or exceeds standards.”

The revised CWA rule specifically provides for state oversight as a safety valve to prevent pollution. The DEP and the SRBC have failed to discourage, monitor and regulate radioactive discharges from nuclear power plants. The NRC has compounded this regulatory collapse by ignoring the content and intent of CWA , Section 401. The rule was designed in large part to protect citizens who live and work around nuclear power plants from radioactive discharges. The Environmental Protection Agency sought to insulate local residents from the previous negligence of regulatory bodies - specifically the Nuclear Regulatory Commission - charged to protect their health and safety.

5 Environmental Protection Agency, P 40, CFR Part 121, [EPA-HQ-OW-2019-0405; FRL-10009-80-OW] RIN 2040-AF86 Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification Rule: Environmental Protection Agency: Final Rule, pp. 47-50.

Finally, the EPA is responsible for developing regulations and guidance to ensure effective implementation of all CWA programs, including section 401. Legislative history indicates that Congress created the water quality certification requirement to “recognize the responsibility of Federal agencies to protect water quality whenever their activities affect public waterways.” S. Rep. No. 91-351, at 3 (1969). “In the past, these [Federal] licenses and permits have been granted without any assurance that the [water quality] standards will be met or even considered.” *Id.* As an example, the legislative history discusses the Atomic Energy Commission's failure to consider the impact of thermal pollution on receiving waters when evaluating “site selection, construction, and design or operation of nuclear power plants. *Id.* (6)

The Supreme Court in 2006 in *S.D. Warren Co. v. Maine Bd. of Env'tl. Prot.*, 547 U.S. 370 (2006) (*S.D. Warren.*) explicitly referenced Senator Edmund Muskie’s speech on the floor of the Senate in their decision.

No polluter will be able to hide behind a Federal license or permit as an excuse for a violation of *water quality standard[s]*. No polluter will be able to make major investments in facilities under a Federal license or permit without providing assurance that the facility will comply with *water quality standards*. No State water pollution control agency will be confronted with a *fait accompli* by an industry that has built a plant without consideration of *water quality requirements*. (7)

6 Federal Register, Vol. 85, No. 134, July 13, 2020/Rules and Regulations, p. 42219.

7 Federal Register, Vol. 85, No. 134, July 13, 2020/Rules and Regulations, p. 42222.

This rule was advertised, discussed, and publicized in full public view. The EPA actively engaged the NRC and its partner agencies regarding the rule modification prior to the rule becoming effective on September 11, 2020.

The EPA engaged with federal agencies that issue licenses or permits subject to section 401, including the United States Department of Agriculture, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Bureau of Reclamation through several meetings and phone calls to gain additional feedback from federal partners. (8)

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”), the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (“Corps”) partner with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The Corps, which is a member of the SRBC, plays a pivotal role regarding water resource allocation at nuclear plants. The Three Mile Island nuclear plant is located within the FERC- designated “exclusion zone.”

We were hoping that the DEP, the NRC, and the SRBC would learn from their previous mistakes. The EPA established a Certification protocol to ensure pollution does not become a routine feature of water use. Regrettably, all these agencies and the NRC seem determined to make the same error and omission relating to the ill gotten license transfer of TMI-2.

8 Document Citation: Federal Register: 40 CFR 121, 85 FR 42210, pp. 42210-42287 (78 pages), Agency/Docket Numbers: EPA-HQ-OW-2019-0405. FRL-10009-80-OW. RIN: 2040-AF86. Document Number: 2020-12081.

In June 1980, the Susquehanna Valley Alliance filed a Complaint and Injunction with the Middle District Court in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania against the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Metropolitan Edison. The Injunction sought to prevent the owner and operator of Three Mile Island from dumping 700,000 gallons of radioactive water into the Susquehanna River. The Injunction was granted, and the NRC was found to be in violation of the National Environmental Policy Act. (9)

The complaint alleges the jurisdictional amount required by 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Plaintiffs' complaint charges that the actions and inactions of the NRC and the actions of the Operators have given rise to four substantive claims. Count I charges violations of section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321-4361, 4332 (1976), and of a provision of the Operators' operating license requiring that the licensee, before engaging in additional construction or operational activity, prepare and record an environmental evaluation of such activity. Count II charges violations of various provisions of the Atomic Energy Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2011-2296 (1976 Supp. I), regulations of the NRC issued pursuant to that Act, and the Operators' license. Count III charges violations of section 301(f) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(f). Count IV alleges that the action of the NRC permitting the Operators to discharge radioactive waste violates plaintiffs' rights under various provisions of the United States Constitution. (9)

TMI-2's license's transfer application was silent on the Clean Water Act, Section 401.

9 *Susquehanna Valley Alliance v. Three Mile Island*: United States Court of Appeals, Third Circuit. Date published: March 17, 1980 Citations 619 F.2d 231 (3d Cir. 1980) No. 79-2446. Argued November 13, 1979. Decided March 17, 1980.

The TMI-1 license renewal in 2008, referenced, “Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Section 401 , State Water Quality Certification, Docket No. 77-076, dated November 9, 1977, issued by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources. TMI-1, which is owned by a separate corporation, failed to disclose or discuss the “interim” and limited content of the DER Settlement with Metropolitan Edison. Despite this oversight, the Unit-1 license was renewed on October 22, 2009. The document referenced in Three Mile Island Unit-1 License Renewal. Appendix B, did not cover the Clean Water Act, Section 401, despite the misleading title.

The NRC ignored the Third Circuit ruling in the TMI-1 relicensing proceeding and stated:

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania issued a Section 401 State Water Quality Certification for the TMI nuclear station on November 9, 1977 (included in Appendix B). Now, AmerGen is applying for NRC approval to extend TMI-1 operations under a renewed license. The NRC has indicated in its Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal that issuance of an NPDES permit by a state implies continued Section 401 certification by the state (NRC 1996, Section 4.2.1.1). The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has EPA authorization to implement the NPDES permitting program. In addition, guidance published by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) states that water quality certifications have been integrated with other required permits and that individual water quality certifications will be issued only for activities that are not regulated by other water quality approvals or permits. Accordingly, as evidence of continued Section 401 certification by Pennsylvania, AmerGen is providing the existing TMI-1 NPDES permit.

The Clean Water Act evidence submitted by Exelon in the TMI-1 relicensing proceeding in 2008 was insufficient, and predated the Clean Water Act, Section 401 Certification rule change in 2020. TMI Unit-2 decommissioning involves a highly radioactive environment with dangerous and unknown quantities of radiation. This factual variable was repeatedly acknowledged in the license transfer application, the NRC's narrative, and the settlement between the DEP and the NRC.

The initial and only National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permit issued in 1977 was explicitly referred to as an "interim agreement. (10) Based on publicly available submissions, TMI-2 did not submit Clean Water Act, Section 401 Certification documents. (11) Silence on the part of the sponsor and regulator was a driving force behind the enactment of the Clean Water Act, Section 401. This was the very tool designed to defeat "fait accompli pollution."

10 Appendix B, Environmental, Report, Clean Water Act Documentation. Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Section 401 State Water Quality Certification Docket No. 77-076-B, dated November 9, 1977, issued by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources. <https://www.nrc.gov/docs/ML0802/ML080220261>.

11 This document was **not** submitted as part of the Application from EnergySolutions and GPU Nuclear, Order Approving and Conforming License Amendments, Three Mile Island Unit, NRC Docket, 50-320, November 12, 2019. Those documents were also addressed and shared with the DEP. The TMI-2 license transfer application purportedly covered environmental compliance under "Environmental Laws" and "Environmental Matters under 4.9."

Under Schedule 4.19.1, there was no discussion of the Clean Water Act, Section 401.

The forty-four year CWA Settlement is limited to the effluent, discharges, effluent quantity and temperature limitations, and restrictive conditions: 1) Effluent discharge from sewage treatment facilities; 2) Limitations regarding the Combined Mechanical Draft Cooling tower; 3) The amount and temperatures of the discharge; and clearly stated, 4) “We do not not certify that the applicant for an NPDES permit is now in compliance with our effluent limitations or permit requirements established pursuant to the Clean Streams Law, Act of June 22, 1937, P.L., 1987, as amended, 35 P.S. 691.1 or that such source is discharging in compliance with the terms or conditions of a state permit. Nor do we certify that by attaining the interim standards contained in the NPDES permit that such source will be in compliance with the aforementioned Clean Stream Law, and the Rules and Regulations Thereunder.” (12)

This was a limited, “interim” Settlement that does not provide in perpetuity environmental relief for 401 certifications, and can not be grandfathered as a means of satisfying the Clean Water Act, Section 401. **This document was not submitted as part of the TMI-2 Application, nor did it authorize the discharge of highly radioactive water into the Susquehanna River.**

The original license holder, Metropolitan Edison, attempted to dump 700,000 gallons of radioactive wastewater into the Susquehanna River. FirstEnergy and TMI-2 Solutions are attempting to repeat Metropolitan Edison and the NRC’s illegal attempt to dump radioactive water directly into the Susquehanna River. The SRBC can correct the error or remain silent and defend radioactive contamination.

12 Environmental Hearing Board, Frederick A. Marraco, Chief Planning Section, DER, Harrisburg Regional; Office, November 9, 1977.

The enclosed excerpt from a January 15, 2021, Nuclear Regulatory Commission letter to NextEra regarding the Point Beach Nuclear Plant, identifies the need for state related agencies - including the DEP or SRBC - to review the criteria from the updated Clean Water Act, Section 401, Water Quality Certification at nuclear plants amending and/or extending their licenses. The NRC staff made the following determinations while performing its review of the Point Beach application:

NextEra has not provided a Clean Water Act ("CWA") Section 401 Water Quality Certification ("WQC") from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (the CWA 401 Certifying Authority), or a documented waiver or other documentation from the Certifying Authority that Section 401 Certification does not apply to the subsequent renewal of the licenses for Point Beach. The staff cannot issue the subsequent renewed licenses without this certification or documented waiver from the Certifying Authority.

As such, the lack of Section 401 certification has the potential to adversely impact the issuance of the subsequent renewed licenses. (13)

The Department of Environmental Protection and/or the Susquehanna River Basin Commission - likewise - must require this documentation from Exelon and FirstEnergy (public utilities) to ensure a valid license of Three Mile Island Unit-2 to TMI-2 Solutions (a limited liability corporation).

13 Point Beach Subsequent License Renewal Acceptance Letter
Document Type: Letter Schedule and Calendars: Date: 01/15/2021.
ML21006A417<https://adamswebsearch2.nrc.gov/webSearch2/main.jsp?AccessionNumber=ML21006A417>.

If this documentation has not been received, both plants, Three Mile Island Unit-1 and Three Mile Island Unit-2, are non-compliant with the Clean Water Act, Section 401, Water Quality Certification.

III. Timeline.

On June 1, 2020, the Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) finalized the “Clean Water Act, Section 401, Certification Rule” to implement the water quality certification process consistent with the text and structure of the Clean Water Act. The final rule establishes procedures that promote consistent implementation and regulatory certainty in the federal licensing and permitting process. The final rule became effective on September 11, 2020.

On November 23, 2021, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission announced an impending order approving that the transfer of a license, and a draft conforming administrative license amendment would be issued on or about December 2, 2020, to Metropolitan Edison Company, Jersey Central Power and Light Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, GPU Nuclear, Inc. (collectively, the FirstEnergy Companies), and TMI-2 Solutions, LLC (together with the FirstEnergy Companies, the applicants).

The Office of the Secretary of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission issued a “Memorandum and Order, (CLI-21-02) entitled “Re: NRC Proceeding, Three Mile Island 50-320 LT,” allowing the license transfer of Three Mile Island, Unit 2 from FirstEnergy to TMI-2 Solutions on January 15, 2021.

This action took place 120 days after the EPA rule became effective. The DEP, the NRC, and the SRBC failed to provide a documented waiver or other documentation from the Certifying Authority that Section 401 Certification does not apply to the nuclear license transfer from a public utility to a a limited liability corporation.

IV. Conclusion.

The Clean Water Act, Section 401 was designed in large part to protect citizens who live and work near nuclear power plants from radioactive discharges. The Environmental Protection Agency sought to insulate local residents from the previous negligence and silence of regulatory bodies charged to protect their health and safety.

Exelon, FirstEnergy, and TMI-2 Solutions failed to provide any justification for an exemption to either the Department of Environmental Protection, the Susquehanna River Basin Commission or the Nuclear Regulatory Commission certifying that the Three Mile Island Nuclear Generating Station is in compliance with the Final Rule: Clean Water Act, Section 401, Certification Rule.

If Exelon, FirstEnergy or TMI-2 Solutions have provided this documentation to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission please provide copies of the documents and related correspondence. If neither the DEP, the NRC or the SRBC have received the necessary documentation, and all of these agencies failed to provide Certification, the current NRC license transfer at Three Mile Island violates the “Clean Water Act, Section 401, Certification Rule.”

As such, the license transfer must be held in Abeyance until the Certification is completed and approved.

Respectfully submitted,
Eric Epstein, Chairman
Three Mile Island Alert, Inc.
4100 Hillsdale Road
Harrisburg, PA 127112

Certification Service

Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.305, I certify that, on this date, a copy of the foregoing “Notification of Closing of TMI-2 Transaction” was served upon the Electronic Information Exchange (the NRC’s E-Filing System) in the above-captioned docket.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Commission Appellate Adjudication
Mail Stop: O-16B33
Washington, DC 20555-0001

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission Office of the Secretary of the Commission
Mail Stop: O-16B33
Washington, DC 20555-0001

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
Mail Stop: T-3F23
Washington, DC 20555-0001
E. Roy Hawken, Chairman

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of the General Counsel
Mail Stop - O-14A44
Washington, DC 20555-0001
Tison A. Campbell, Anita G. Naber, David E. Roth, Jeremy L. Wachutka E-

Daniel F. Stenger, Esq. Sachin Desai, Esq.
Hogan, Lovells, US LLP
555 Thirteenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004

Timothy P. Matthews,
Grant W. Eskelsen, Esq.
Morgan, Lewis & Bokius, LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

Russell G. Workman, Esq.
TMI-2 Solutions, LLC
423 West 300 South, Suite 200 S
alt Lake City, UT 841901

Karen A. Sealy, Esq.
FirstEnergy Service Company
76 South Main Street A
Akron, OH 44308

Ryan K. Lighty, Esq.
Morgan, Lewis, and Bockius, LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

Alicia R. Duke Assistant Counsel P
Southcentral Regional Office
909 Elmerton Avenue, Third Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17110-8200

Andrew Gavin
Susquehanna River Basin Commission
4423 North Front Street,
Harrisburg, PA 17110

Enclosure

From: "Ballaron, Paula" <PBallaron@srbc.net>
Date: January 27, 2021 11:24:22 AM EST
To: Eric Epstein <epstein@efmr.org>
Cc: "Gavin, Andrew" <AGavin@srbc.net>, "Veno, Gene" <gveno@srbc.net>, "Oyler, Jason" <joyler@srbc.net>, Data Requests _E_mail <{F135020}.SRBC@dms.srbc.net>
Subject: RE: Before the SRBC, (Testimony of Eric J. Epstein, December 11, 2020)

Good morning, Eric.

Thank you for your comments to the Commission regarding the status of TMI. As stated in my last message, I reached out to staff at PADEP with some of your questions; I was hoping to complete our responses by last Friday, so please accept my apologies for the delay.

Based on my review, I've listed your questions below along with the Commission's response (blue).

1. TMI-Alert is requesting the Commission compel Exelon and FirstEnergy to reduce their excess water capacity. Three Mile Island's water use contracts are antiquated, and require modification and the adoption of revised "triggers" that reflect: 1) Used and useful life of plant, 2) Operational or deactivated status of power plants; and, 3) Termination contract with firm dates.

Commission staff is working with TMI operators to determine operating parameters considering the change in status of the plant, and will recommend modifications to docket approvals as appropriate.

2. [T]he SRBC should determine the amount of water needed on a daily basis - and returned to the river - for decontaminating and decommissioning TMI's reactors.

The consumptive use, surface withdrawal, and groundwater withdrawal approvals from SRBC have not changed yet as a result of the non-operating status, and TMI continues to submit the monitoring data required under these approvals. Commission staff recognize an ongoing need for water withdrawals and consumptive use related to decommissioning. The Commission will modify the approvals, as appropriate, based on all relevant data, including the reasonable foreseeable need for the decontamination and decommissioning processes at the project.

3. How is the new batch of contaminated radioactive water from Three Mile Island going to be treated? Will it be dumped directly into the river? The Susquehanna River Basin Commission needs to address and answer the following questions we raised in our Testimony on August 18, 2008: “What systems and components contain radioactively contaminated water? What methods are being used to monitor leakage of radioactive contaminated water from the systems and components? What methods are being used to monitor the grounds around the facility for potential leakage of radioactively contaminated water? What assurance is there against a leak of radioactively contaminated water remaining undetected long enough to permit migration offsite? Will Three mile Island dump radioactive water directly into the Susquehanna River?”

The SRBC does not regulate water treatment, water quality or quantity of discharges, or containment measures at a project site. Questions related to the treatment, storage, and disposal of radioactively contaminated water should be directed to agencies responsible for review and oversight of those activities, including the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection Bureau of Radiation Protection. It is our understanding that the regulatory licensing for the radiological parts of the site remain at the federal level with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

4. Who or what actually owns the ground water and surface water rights for TMI-1? GPU? FirstEnergy? AmerGen? Exelon? Or, TMI-2 Solutions? Based on the Commission’s protocols, doesn’t ending the recognition of “pre-compact” or “grandfathered” consumptive uses or withdrawals upon a change of ownership, negate the transfer of project approvals?

The SRBC has docket approvals and contracts covering water withdrawals and use at TMI Unit 1; therefore, grandfathering is not a factor for any transfer of approvals.

Thank you for your patience and understanding as Commission staff continue to work to obtain clarity on the key water issues related to decommissioning.

Best regards,
Paula

Paula Ballaron, P.G.
Manager, Policy Implementation & Outreach
Susquehanna River Basin Commission
4423 North Front Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110-1788
www.srbc.net