

VY

APR - 3 2008

JESSE M. CORUM, IV  
116 Oak Street  
Brattleboro, VT 05301

April 2, 2008

Windham Regional Commission  
Attn: Joe Matteau, Executive Director  
139 Main Street  
Brattleboro, VT 05301

RE: Petition of Vermont Yankee/Entergy  
Certificate of Public Good

Dear Mr. Matteau:

I was at the hearing on Thursday, 27 March 2008 sponsored by the Windham Regional Commission and had signed up to speak along with my wife, who was able to speak, but I had to leave before my name was called. I understand Tom Heydinger took my place. Nevertheless, I wanted to pass along to the Commission some of my comments that I would have made had I not had to leave.

First, though having been recently elected to the Brattleboro Town Selectboard, I am not making these comments in that capacity. Nor as a member of the Board of Directors of Youth Services for over 25 years, am I making my comments in that capacity. Rather, my comments are as an individual citizen of the State of Vermont and a resident of the Town of Brattleboro for a little over thirty years.

Second, I would support the comments of my fellow Board member David Dunn in terms of the incredible generosity of Vermont Yankee/Entergy (hereinafter VY) through the years that I have been on the Board of Youth Services. Though I recognize and would acknowledge that VY is a good corporate citizen, and that it makes large amounts of money, there are corporations which do the same but are not good corporate citizens.

Third, I do believe that it is in the public good that VY continue and be relicensed for a period of not less than 20 years.

I tire of the constant refrain of those who claim that VY should be shut down and yet propose no reasonable, viable, economical alternative. I am in favor of wind power, solar power, water power, obtaining energy from alternative fuels such as cellulosic biomass resources. However, even though the Searsburg wind project consisting of, I believe, 11 wind turbines are up and running they do not run nearly as efficiently as VY, nor produce nearly the amount of electricity as VY. Further, if someone were to propose that additional

wind turbines be put up there or at other locations in southern Vermont, I daresay that the opponents will come out of the woodwork for aesthetic reasons or other NIMBY type reasons. As far as water goes, there are numerous dams on the Connecticut River but, likewise, none of them alone or in conjunction with one another can replace the power that would be produced by VY were it to close in March 2012. There is no way in my humble opinion that we can begin to replace the power generated by VY at the Vernon plant by any combination of wind, solar, water or alternative fuels and be up and running by March 2012.

I would also point out, and you may be aware of this, that the National Petroleum Council (NPC), which is an oil and natural gas advisory committee to our nation's Secretary of Energy, recently completed a huge study that took a year and a half and included more than 250 participants from diverse backgrounds and organizations as well as a dialogue with more than 1,000 persons in groups actively involved in energy. The NPC concluded that over the next 25 years the United States and the world face hard truths about the global energy future. Recognizing that there are accumulating risks to continuing expansion of oil and natural gas production, the conventional sources relied upon historically, the study concluded that to mitigate the risks, expansion of all economic energy sources will be required including coal, nuclear, other renewables and unconventional oil and natural gas. It did recognize that each of these sources faces significant challenges including safety, environmental, political and economic hurdles and some impose infrastructure requirements for development and delivery. Nevertheless, and most importantly, of the five core strategies it is most interesting that this study concluded that the United States must:

Expand and diversify production from clean coal, nuclear, biomass or other renewables and unconventional oil and gas; moderate the decline of conventional domestic oil and gas production; and increase access for development of new resources. (NPC letter 18 July 2007 addressed to the Honorable Samuel W. Bodman, Secretary of Energy).

I do not pretend to know all the risks, liabilities, and other concerns posed by continued operation of VY here in Vermont. However, my knowledge of several people employed by Entergy leaves me to conclude that the company over the years has been managed well and that any and all safety concerns are addressed with the necessary importance that they deserve. When I speak with these individuals I am always impressed at the numerous checks and balances that have to be gone through by them, all of which insure the safe operation of the plant as well as those of us who benefit from it and live near it.

Presently nuclear energy contributes only about 6% of the world's energy. There is no doubt that its use outside the United States is generally expected to increase.

Overall when I juxtapose the minimal to nil carbon "footprint" of VY against all the CO<sub>2</sub> from today's coal fired electricity generation in this country, if collected and compressed, would total 50 million barrels a day, I cannot but support and believe that the continued operation of VY should be granted and would be in the best interest of all Vermonters. My understanding is that it generates 30% of the electricity for Vermont and

that 50% of the electricity generated goes to the grid to be used outside of this state. Thus, not only will it benefit those of us here in Vermont but many others in other states as well.

Thank you for your consideration of my observations.

Sincerely,

  
Jesse M. Corum IV

PO Box 6001  
Brattleboro, VT 05302-6001  
April 7, 2008

Stephen Wark, Director  
Consumer Affairs & Public Information Division  
Vermont Department of Public Service  
112 State Street, Drawer 20  
Montpelier, VT 05620-2601

Dear Mr. Wark,

**Re: Petition by Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC ("EVY"), and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. ("ENO") (collectively with EVY, "Entergy VY"), for such approvals from the Board and the Vermont General Assembly as may be required to operate the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station ("VY Station") after March 21, 2012.**

Due to another commitment, I was not able to attend the public hearing in Brattleboro, VT on April 2, 2008 concerning the above captioned docket. From at least one news account ("Protesters taunt DPS; 100 attend VY meeting," *Brattleboro Reformer*, April 3, 2008, pg. 1), there was perhaps more heat than light generated.

Nevertheless, as a concerned layperson, I should like to address two of the questions reportedly raised by DPS:

What are your concerns about the Vermont Yankee power facility?

While critical nuclear related systems, specified in law or regulation, might very well be monitored and inspected by the NRC and given due attention by VY, it appears that maintenance and refurbishing of other parts of the plant are suffering. The partial collapse of the cooling fan structure, the duct tape pipe repairs and, most recently, an unlocated leaking condenser ("VY can't find leak, slowly powers up," *Brattleboro Reformer*, April 4, 2008, pg. 1) are examples of these problems. One could argue that this is evidence of a company attempting to squeeze the last profits from an aging facility. But one need not reach that far. Suffice it to say that the public good would be better served by requiring Vermont Yankee to adhere to a much higher level of scrutiny based on the recent record of maintenance and aging plant "events."

**Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee**What alternatives are there to continued operation of Vermont Yankee?

Entergy recently commissioned an economic study concluding that the local economy would experience dire consequences should the plant cease operation. This commissioned study was uni-dimensional and does not well serve the State of Vermont or the local Brattleboro community. It is tautological to say, that, were the plant to close, jobs would be lost, investment and VY public relations benefice to local non-profits would cease.

Some of the harder and more honest questions to be assessed by an independent economic study are:

§ If renewable energy sources were given comparable governmental support and were placed on an equal footing with the existing VY plant, what would be their resulting level of energy production? As an example of the existing disparity, consider that consumers need to monetarily "opt in" to a program such as CVPS Cow Power, but have no corresponding ability to "opt out" of subsidies to VY.

§ What economic benefit can be projected as a result of an expanding 'green energy sector'? What longer term benefits would accrue from retaining younger professional workers in Vermont?

§ Additionally, how would one economically account for the negative consequences of a sudden catastrophic collapse of VY?

This debate over VY should be a signal for us to begin a serious strategy to realistically diversify all energy generation in Vermont. Thank you for your time and attention to these remarks.

Sincerely,



Robert A. Oeser

Enclosure

Letter dated October 12, 2007 to US NRC / ASLB