

From: <SumacBie@aol.com>
To: <NRCREP@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jun 27, 2007 8:44 PM
Subject: Docket No. 72-26

5/31/07
72 FK 30398

10

RECEIVED

2007 JUN 28 AM 10:33

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
UC:RRC

To James R. Hall
Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Re: Docket No. 72-26

I am writing to comment on the NRC Staff's Supplement to the Environmental Assessment and Draft Finding of No Significant Impact Related to the Construction and Operation of the Diablo Canyon Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation. This document, written in response to the decision by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace v. NRC, to address the environmental impacts of intentional attacks on the Diablo Canyon dry cask storage facility is inadequate and I believe, unacceptable.

On every point, the EA falls far short of the kind of documentation that adequately reflects the (real) mission of the NRC:

"The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) was created as an independent agency by Congress in 1974 to enable the nation to safely use radioactive materials for beneficial civilian purposes while ensuring that people and the environment are protected."

Some of the reports inadequacies include a distortion and trivialization of the environmental impacts of attacks on the facility by using hidden and unjustified assumptions. In all matters relating to the construction and long-term maintenance of an ISFSI at Diablo Canyon, the NRC appears to put the interests of the corporate entity (PG&E) ahead of the reactor community and surrounding natural environment (which is under-represented here, to say the least). In considering the consequences of potential releases of radioactive material, the NRC has employed only one indicator, namely "the potential for early fatalities." To exclude consequences other than early fatalities is absurd. Land contamination is a very serious impact that can cause delayed fatalities, illness, and billions of dollars in expenses of relocation and lost income. Radiation, in any dose, is not benign and should always be considered an environmental contaminant.

The lack of inclusion of future needs, (beyond the life-expectancy of the dry-casks, etc) and considerations in any/all assessments is a substantial lack planning and missing from this document.

I believe the EA for the Diablo Canyon spent fuel storage facility completely fails to demonstrate the NRC made a "fully informed and well-considered" determination of no significant impacts, and I would like to see more realistic and thorough long-term planning included in this and future assessments.

Sincerely,

F-RIDS = ADM-03
Call = J. Hall (JRH)

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Susan Biesek

 See what's free at
<http://www.aol.com>.</HTML>

Mail Envelope Properties (46830460.F68 : 9 : 57192)

Subject: Docket No. 72-26
Creation Date Wed, Jun 27, 2007 8:43 PM
From: <SumacBie@aol.com>

Created By: SumacBie@aol.com

Recipients

nrc.gov
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
NRCREP

Post Office

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2635	Wednesday, June 27, 2007 8:43 PM
Mime.822	3715	

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
ReplyRequested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered

Junk Mail handling disabled by User
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator
Junk List is not enabled
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled
Block List is not enabled