

Coyle, James

From: David Kennedy [dkanomaly@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, November 07, 2011 12:56 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

10/4/2011
76 FR 61402
(5)

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

David Kennedy
1714 W Indianola Ave
Phoenix, AZ 85015-5555

RECEIVED

NOV 07 PM 2:52

NUCLEAR REGULATORY
COMMISSION

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

FRIDS = ADM-03
Addr = J. Coyle (Sec 11)

Coyle, James

From: Anthony Arcure [newhope4us5@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, November 07, 2011 12:24 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Anthony Arcure
4218 W. Fountain Way
Fresno, CA 93722

Coyle, James

From: Anthony Arcure [newhope4us5@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, November 07, 2011 12:24 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Anthony Arcure
4218 W. Fountain Way
Fresno, CA 93722

Coyle, James

From: Thomas Wilson [ba1THOMore@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 06, 2011 7:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Thomas Wilson
1161 Quantril Way
1161 Quantril Way
Baltimore City, MD 212053254

Coyle, James

From: Abdessalam Diab [friendiab@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 06, 2011 5:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Abdessalam Diab
6 Algazaer St. Almohandseen
Giza, Egypt, ot 12411

Coyle, James

From: Nancy Chismar [nanc999@optonline.net]
Sent: Sunday, November 06, 2011 2:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Nancy Chismar
6 York Dr Apt 6A
Edison, NJ 08817

Coyle, James

From: Ben Oscar Andersson [oscarsito1057@wildmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 06, 2011 6:09 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Ben Oscar Andersson
55 My Street
My Hometown, IL 60601

Coyle, James

From: roy guild [royguild1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 05, 2011 10:17 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

roy guild
122 great hill pond rd
122 great hill pond rd.
portland, CT 06480

Coyle, James

From: Fletcher Cossa [fletchercoxa@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 05, 2011 6:25 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Fletcher Cossa
622 East 20th Street
New York, NY 10009

Coyle, James

From: patricia lasek [daisyl376@care2.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 05, 2011 1:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms patricia lasek
Care2
8432 trenton falls rd
po box 56
barneveld, NY 13304

Coyle, James

From: Mark Skaret [ka1vfg@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 05, 2011 1:31 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mark Skaret
153 Riverton Rd
Riverton, CT 06065

Coyle, James

From: Howard Cohen [howard@cohensw.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2011 12:55 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Howard Cohen
3272 Cowper Street
3272 Cowper Street
Palo Alto, CA 94306

Coyle, James

From: Marcia Evers [marskanovich@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 11:06 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Marcia Evers
2200 Robinhood Trail
Austin, TX 78703

Coyle, James

From: Chris Campbell [stobal7@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 9:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Chris Campbell
4900 N Lawndale Ave Apt B
Chicago, IL 60625

Coyle, James

From: Bob Fay [RFay808700@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 4:33 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Bob Fay
33714
4000 24th St.N.
Lot 1108
St. Petersburg, FL 33714

Coyle, James

From: Hal Trufan [htrufan@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 4:15 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Hal Trufan
6808 Old Forge Dr
Charlotte, NC 28226

Coyle, James

From: Ken Welke [lieugy@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 2:29 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Ken Welke
821 glen miller dr.
821 glen miller dr.
Windsor, CA 95492

Coyle, James

From: Barry Lefsky [fix4net@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 2:21 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Barry Lefsky
3600 Lakeshore Ave
Oakland, CA 94610

Coyle, James

From: J.A. Dingman [jdingman11@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 10:47 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. J.A. Dingman
retired
P.O. Box 10796
2602 Gracewood Dr.
Greensboro, NC 27404-0796

Coyle, James

From: Andrea Ackerman [mullaneyandackerman@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 10:36 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Andrea Ackerman
109 West 26th St
109 West 26th Street, NY, NY 10001
New York, NY 10001

Coyle, James

From: Arthur Kennedy [artkennedy1@cox.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:04 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

If the purpose of NRC regulation is to 'enable' use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? ?

The only valid purpose for NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Arthur Kennedy
self employed
6768 Sueno Road
Unit B
Isla Vista, CA 93117-4904

Coyle, James

From: Vic Anderson [sixt2ndpatriot@hushmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:38 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now. It's Nuking FUT\$!

Mr. Vic Anderson
We the People
1999 Bradbury Road
OK
Eagle Lake, FL 33880

Coyle, James

From: Arthur Kennedy [artkennedy1@cox.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:04 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

If the purpose of NRC regulation is to 'enable' use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? ?

The only valid purpose for NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Arthur Kennedy
self employed
6768 Sueno Road
Unit B
Isla Vista, CA 93117-4904

Coyle, James

From: Vic Anderson [sixt2ndpatriot@hushmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:38 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now. It's Nuking FUT\$!

Mr. Vic Anderson
We the People
1999 Bradbury Road
OK
Eagle Lake, FL 33880

Coyle, James

From: Ashley Boling [ashleyboling@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now. Outraged! Ashley Boling

Ashley Boling
citizen of Colorado
512 Society Dr.
Telluride, CO 81435

Coyle, James

From: Jane Eiseley [jeiseley2@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2011 6:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

n/a Jane Eiseley
n/a
1320 Addison St C432
C432
Berkeley, CT 94702

Coyle, James

From: Timothy O'Connell [oconnell108@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2011 7:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Timothy O'Connell
415 Sherrow Avenue
Falls Church, VA 22046-4141

Coyle, James

From: Susaan Aram [mermaidlaguna@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2011 10:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Susaan Aram
1361 Terrace Way
Laguna Beach, CA 92651

Coyle, James

From: Dolores Pieper [dolorespie@embarqmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2011 11:33 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Dolores Pieper
Dept. of Defense
486 Galahad Dr.
486 Galahad Dr.
Franklin, IN 46131-8997

Coyle, James

From: Diane Timko [Diane.Timko@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 12:53 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Diane Timko
18420 Gottschalk
18420 Gottschalk
Homewood, IL 60430

Coyle, James

From: Nina Keller [ninakeller@crocker.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2011 3:38 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs Nina Keller
NMH School
28 Cold Brook Rd
28 cold brook rd millers falls MA
Millers Falls, MA 01349

Coyle, James

From: Jeff Archuleta [jcarchuleta@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 4:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

After watching this you'll say, "I did not see that coming!"

<http://vimeo.com/7761485>

Expertly shot & edited. Done with so much insight & attention to detail that most women who see it can't believe it was created by a man.

<http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0033811/>

jeff, great job on your short.

> very clean. i am impressed

> peace

<http://www.imdb.com/name/nm1843310/>

*I have
nothing to
do with
topple.*

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jeff Archuleta
Renegade Masters
6 Broadway #217
Denver, CO 80203

Coyle, James

From: Anthony Maresco [antmars@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2011 11:18 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Anthony Maresco
154 N. Clinton St.
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601-2019

Coyle, James

From: john scahill [johnpatrickscahill@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2011 10:34 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr john scahill
private citizen
po box 10740
2024 sarah st
pittsburgh, PA 15203

Coyle, James

From: Susan Mullins [mullsr@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2011 10:01 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Susan Mullins
110 Mountain Avenue
110 Mountain Avenue
Bloomfield, NJ 07003

Coyle, James

From: John Teevan [jptrugger@cox.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2011 9:42 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

John Teevan
1136 Misty Creek Street
Chula Vista, CA 91913

Coyle, James

From: Dr. Lewis Cuthbert [aceactivists@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2011 7:26 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Alliance For A C Dr. Lewis Cuthbert
Alliance For A Clean Environment
1189 Foxview Road
1189 Foxview Road
Pottstown, PA 19465

Coyle, James

From: Maureen Kavanagh [afoiee@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2011 1:42 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Maureen Kavanagh
48-25 43 street apt 2 J
Woodside, NY 11377-6834

Coyle, James

From: Daniel Zelter [danielzelter@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2011 1:16 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Daniel Zelter
7719 Willoughby Ave.
L.A., CA 90046

Coyle, James

From: Howard Cohen [howard@cohensw.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2011 12:55 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Howard Cohen
3272 Cowper Street
3272 Cowper Street
Palo Alto, CA 94306

Coyle, James

From: Eric Burr [burrski@methownet.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 11:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Eric Burr
Canadian Wildlife Federation
585 Lost River Road
585 Lost River Road
Mazama, WA 98833

Coyle, James

From: Keiko Kokobun [keiko.kokobun@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 10:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Keiko Kokobun
647 Morgan Road
Salisbury, VT
Salisbury, VT 05769

Coyle, James

From: Laura Simon [laurasim@juno.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 10:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MI Laura Simon Laura Simon
none
P.O. Box 1112
P.O. Box 1112
Wilder, VT 05088

Coyle, James

From: Renee Austin [neoludite0711@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 9:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Renee Austin
NIRS
P. O. Box #142
P. O. Box #142
Birchrunville, PA 19421

Coyle, James

From: Christopher Currie [curriec@onesalt.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 9:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Christopher Currie
161 Lake Shore Drive

Pascoag, RI 02859-3211

Coyle, James

From: Elizabeth Enright [eenright2@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 9:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Rev Elizabeth Enright
6222 E. Avalon Dr
6222 E. Avalon Dr
Scottsdale, AZ 85251-7006

Coyle, James

From: John Buck [ltcjlbg@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 8:52 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. & Mrs John Buck
105 Lyndenbury Dr
Apex, NC 27502

Coyle, James

From: Aaron Kogel Smucker [adk01@hampshire.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 8:31 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Aaron Kogel Smucker
193 2nd Ave
New York City, NY 10003

Coyle, James

From: mira el [miramuse@snowcrest.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 8:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mira el
1409 higland dr
mt shasta, CA 96067

Coyle, James

From: Virginia Hilker [vthnews@verizon.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 8:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Virginia Hilker
sierra club
421 Calle de Castellana
421 Calle de Castellana
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Coyle, James

From: Jolana Valek [jolanavanek@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 7:50 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jolana Valek
ACT
100 West Colorado Avenue
POB 1555
Telluride, CO 81435

Coyle, James

From: Christopher Lish [lishchris@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 7:32 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Christopher Lish
PO Box 113
Olema, CA 94950

Coyle, James

From: Linda Graff [grafflinda@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 6:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Linda Graff
Concerned Citizens of Perryville
700 Feltz Street
N/A
Perryville, MO 63775

Coyle, James

From: Sharon McMenamin [saoirse9@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 6:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Sharon McMenamin
Individual
199 Franklin Street, Apt. 2
199 Franklin St., Apt. 2
Brooklyn, NY 11222

Coyle, James

From: Nancy Bender [nancybender@ameritech.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 6:36 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Nancy Bender
6316 N. Hermitage
6316 N. Hermitage Ave.
Chicago, IL 60660-1106

Coyle, James

From: Joan Taslitz [jodyt@surfree.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 6:15 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Joan Taslitz
1418 Edendale St.
1418 Edendale St.
Cleveland Hts, OH 44121

Coyle, James

From: ERIN YARROBINO [BGGR34@AOL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 6:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ERIN YARROBINO
84-23 109 AVE
84-23 109 ave
OZONE PARK, NY 11417-1410

Coyle, James

From: glenda Gloss [fusioninx@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 5:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms glenda Gloss
none
NDCBU 6994
ndcbu 6994
Taos, NM 87571

Coyle, James

From: Faith Petric [faithpet@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 5:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Faith Petric
none
885 Clayton
none
San Francisco, CA 94117

Coyle, James

From: Lois Zinavage [wzinavage@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 5:25 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Lois Zinavage
Citizens' Action Network, CT
51 Hanover-Versailles Rd.
None
Baltic, CT 06330

Coyle, James

From: Sybil Kohl [sybkohl@msn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 4:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Sybil Kohl
18103 N.E. 159th Ave.
18103 N.E. 159th Ave.
Brush Prairie, WA 98606-8738

Coyle, James

From: Mary Cato [mary.e.cato@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 4:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Mary Cato
1807 Pecan Park Drive
Arlington, TX 76012

Coyle, James

From: Thomas Meacham [tom.meacham@wku.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 4:28 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Thomas Meacham
1322 Leeson Drive
Bowling Green, KY 42103-1526

Coyle, James

From: Faith Sadley [fsadley@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 4:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Faith Sadley
3305 George St.
3305 George St.
Thunderbolt, GA 31404

Coyle, James

From: Philip Ratcliff [skazz999W@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 4:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Philip Ratcliff
15 Foster Ct.
Cloverdale, CA 95425

Coyle, James

From: Dane horn [thorshammer_1961@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 4:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Dane horn
631 Dixon Branch Road
631 Dixon Branch Road
Loretto, TN 38469

Coyle, James

From: Molly Fleming [mcfleming@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 4:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Molly Fleming
425 Flynn Avenue
425 Flynn Avenue
Burlington, VT 05401

Coyle, James

From: Bonnie Barfield [bonbon33@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 4:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Bonnie Barfield
1036 Huntington TR SE
1036 Huntington TR SE
Smyrna, GA 30082-2635

Coyle, James

From: Gary Vesperman [garyvesperman@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 3:33 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Gary Vesperman
Clean Energy Inventions
588 Lake Huron Lane
588 Lake Huron Lane
Boulder City, NV 89005-1018

Coyle, James

From: Frank Aaron [f_aaron3@Hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 3:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Frank Aaron
5801 Pisa Lane
5801
Frisco, TX 75034-2275

Coyle, James

From: Mary Mathews [timmary747@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 2:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Mary Mathews
1111 S Waukegan Rd
1111 S Waukegan Rd
Lake Forest, IL 60045

Coyle, James

From: brian shera [timshera@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 2:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr. brian shera
none
76 nature lake road
none
liberty, NY 12754

Coyle, James

From: Axel Vogt [vogt@ub.uni-freiburg.de]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 2:30 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Axel Vogt
Reinhold-Schneider-Str. 15
Freiburg, ot 79117

Coyle, James

From: Charlotte Shoemaker [charshoes@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 2:05 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Charlotte Shoemaker
1618 Parker St.
Berkeley, CA 94703

Coyle, James

From: Klaus Steinbrecher [kps@ksteinbrecher.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 1:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Klaus Steinbrecher
P.O. Box 517
Angel Fire, NM 87710

Coyle, James

From: Paul Best [ilovepaulbest@netzero.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 1:32 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Paul Best
1426 Van Buren AV
San Diego, CA 92103

Coyle, James

From: Daniel Farella [bmarley343@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 1:31 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Daniel Farella
1990 4th St
1990 4th street
North Brunswick, NJ 08902-4529

Coyle, James

From: Nancy Farrell [nfarrellvt@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 1:29 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Nancy Farrell
NEA
4005 N. 24th St.
Tacoma, WA 98406-4804

Coyle, James

From: Todd Hildebrandt [hildegan@earthlink.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 1:20 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

The NRC needs to act as a vigilant watchdog for public safety and health, not as lapdog for the nuclear industry. Far too often the close nature of regulators to industry has created conflict and dysfunction. We can not afford to have the NRC either in the pocket of those they regulate, or asleep at the wheel.

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Todd Hildebrandt
P.O. Box 189
none
Elmira, OR 97437-0189

Coyle, James

From: Anita Minton [anitaminton@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 1:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Anita Minton
Tallahassee Area Community, INC
P.O.Box 434
12150 Hwy 9
Guffey, CO 80820

Coyle, James

From: Oscar Revilla Alguacil [oscarrevilla10@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 1:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Oscar Revilla Alguacil
Maqueda
Madrid, ot 28024

Coyle, James

From: Caryn Cowin [caryn_cowin@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 1:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Caryn Cowin
317 Monterey Road
Apt. 15
South Pasadena, CA 91030-3517

Coyle, James

From: Susan Keck [denisej@nirs.org]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 12:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Susan Keck
Nuclear Info and Resource Service
650 Mulahollen Dr
4226 31st St,
Monroe, MI 48161

Coyle, James

From: Julia Rouvier [julia.rouvier@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 12:38 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Julia Rouvier
Flagstaff Nuclear Awareness Project
1450 W. Kaibab #83
1450 W. Kaibab #83
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Coyle, James

From: Eunice Eckerly [eunicee@trinity-lc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 12:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Eunice Eckerly
myself
2015 Riverside Avenue
#210
Minneapolis, MN 55454

Coyle, James

From: Margaret Marie [margmarie2001@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 12:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Margaret Marie
individual concerned person
509 West Main Street
5099 West Main Street
Washington, IA 52353

Coyle, James

From: Gary Sachs [garyfromvermont@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 11:58 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Gary Sachs
box 1864
box 1864
Brattleboro, VT 05302

Coyle, James

From: Carol Putnam [crayola@centurytel.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 11:45 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Carol Putnam
P.O. Box 759
La Veta, CO 81055

Coyle, James

From: Joyce Murphy [Joyce.Murphy.lv@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 11:26 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Joyce Murphy
3360 Ft. Smith Dr
3360 Ft. Smith Dr
Las Vegas, NV 89122

Coyle, James

From: Fran Burton [fran.l.burton@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 11:21 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Fran Burton
Retired Educator
1 Galax Ave
Asheville, NC 28806

Coyle, James

From: Cindy Lang [Lyonstpa@msn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 11:09 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now. DOES THE WORD JAPAN MEAN ANYTHING TO YOU AT ALL?

MS. Cindy Lang
Voter
12335 lacey Dr.
12335 Lacey Dr
New Port Richey, FL 34654

Coyle, James

From: Suzanne Garver [wi2oh@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 9:57 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Suzanne Garver
5915 Linder Circle NE
Canton, OH 44721-3638

Coyle, James

From: Arthur Fisher [art363@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 9:50 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr Arthur Fisher
none
10225 nikolich av
10225 nikolich av
Hastings, FL 32145-4657

Coyle, James

From: PJ Quell [ledpq@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 9:45 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

PJ Quell
5425 Mastin
Merriam, KS 66203

Coyle, James

From: Carol Morrison [carol.morrison@uvm.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 9:28 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Carol Morrison
957 Miller Rd.
n/a
E. Dummerston, VT 05346

Coyle, James

From: Jeff Rago [Jeff@JRago.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 9:17 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Jeff Rago
26570 L'Anse Creuse Street
Harrison Township, MI 48045-2580

Coyle, James

From: Laura Silverman [lgsilverman@optonline.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 9:12 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Laura Silverman
30 Rose Road
West Nyack, NY 10994-2116

Coyle, James

From: Sharyn Scull [Rodenhams@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 8:59 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Sharyn Scull
small business owner
902 Birdie Way
902 Birdie Way
St Augustine, FL 32080

Coyle, James

From: Jeremy Rossman [jeremysrossman@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 8:54 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jeremy Rossman
674 Driftwood Ln
Northbrook, IL 60062

Coyle, James

From: Craig Brown [cbrown@monkeybridge.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 8:53 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Craig Brown
2908 Southbrook Drive
Bloomington, MN 55431

Coyle, James

From: Roger Holmen [Rogerhlmn@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 8:36 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

In post-Fukushima times, the NRC is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

In its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

In reality, the purpose of the NRC and its regulations are to protect the public health and safety.

If the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

Our government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Roger Holmen
Individual
4301 National Parks Hwy
E-9
Carlsbad, NM 88220-9033

Coyle, James

From: MARILYN & TOM FINNELLI [MARILYN52141.TOM71737@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 7:54 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MARILYN & TOM FINNELLI
1847 EAGLES PT.
APOPKA, FL 32712-2055

Coyle, James

From: Millicent Sims [menucha65@verizon.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 7:14 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Millicent Sims
none
12 Roosevelt Place
n/a
Montclair, NJ 07042-3316

Coyle, James

From: Tim Ryther [tdryther@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 7:05 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Tim Ryther
114 Spring Creek
114 Spring Creek St.
Waco, TX 76705-1031

Coyle, James

From: Ron Gonzalez [ron_go87124@msn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 6:42 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Ron Gonzalez
Organization
3816 Rancher Loop
3816 Rancher Loop
Rio Rancho, NM 87144-6273

Coyle, James

From: Jeri Levitt [discojeri@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 6:15 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jeri Levitt
8 Lakeville Road
Boston, MA
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130, MA 02130

Coyle, James

From: Joseph Mustion [jmustion@tampabay.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 6:09 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Joseph Mustion
x
2906 Arrowsmith Rd
xx
Wimauma, FL 33598

Coyle, James

From: michael boshears [a1mixer@verizon.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 5:41 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr michael boshears
p.o. box 3684
crestline, CA 92325

Coyle, James

From: courtney lewis [anellalei@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 5:12 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

courtney lewis
1801 w 48th ave apt 113
anchorage, AK 99517

Coyle, James

From: Daniel Stickney [daniel.stickney@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 4:30 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Daniel Stickney
933 E. Moorhead Cir.
Boulder, CO 80305

Coyle, James

From: Christine Wenner [sunflower29@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 3:57 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Christine Wenner
25 Rettinger Road
Halifax, PA 17032

Coyle, James

From: Mark Hull-Richter [mhullrich@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 3:34 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Mark Hull-Richter
Self
P.O. Box 11062
Santa Ana, CA 92711

Coyle, James

From: liz helenchild [deejayliz@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 3:24 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

liz helenchild
box 1276
mendocino, AR 95460

Coyle, James

From: Janice Mastin-Kamps [janmk1978@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 2:46 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Janice Mastin-Kamps
944 Meadow Gateway
Medina, OH 44256

Coyle, James

From: Waid & Cheri Reynolds [grannygear@waidreynolds.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 2:41 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Waid & Cheri Reynolds
4983 Bonita Bay Dr
St George, UT 84790

Coyle, James

From: Judy W. Soffler [judywsoffler@optonline.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 2:34 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Judy W. Soffler
8
New City, NY 10956-6434

Coyle, James

From: anne veraldi [anneveraldi@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 2:29 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

anne veraldi
na
2
21 lapidge
sf, CA 94110

Coyle, James

From: linda satter [lndashome@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 2:01 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

linda satter
198 bonnet st
manchester ctr, VT 05255

Coyle, James

From: bruce corelitz [bcorelitz@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 1:58 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

bruce corelitz

los osos, CA 93402

Coyle, James

From: Dennis Smith [safetywork4u@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 1:39 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dennis Smith
5723 Schornbush Rd.
5723 Schornbush Rd. Deming, wa
Deming, WA 98244

Coyle, James

From: Stephen Schenck [stephen1schenck@spamex.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 1:16 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Stephen Schenck
P.O. Box 397
P.O. Box 397
Simi Valley, CA 93062

Coyle, James

From: Howard Beeman [grandma@beeman.org]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 12:48 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr Howard Beeman
21024 Road 95
Woodland, CA 95695

Coyle, James

From: Tom Jackson [scrimm@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 12:48 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Tom Jackson
1124 S King St.
Denver, CO 80219-3923

Coyle, James

From: Leslie Burpo [lburpo@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 12:46 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Leslie Burpo
P.O. Box 5468
Eugene, OR 97405

Coyle, James

From: Gloria Kegeles [chromepotos@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 12:40 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Gloria Kegeles
PO Box 874
PO Box 874
Wendell, MA 01379

Coyle, James

From: Kirk Miller [kirkmiller3@juno.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 12:29 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Kirk Miller
517 Cap Rock Drive
Richardson, TX 75080

Coyle, James

From: Margaret Teahan [mtea8198@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 12:29 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Margaret Teahan
N/A
175 Route 340
175 Route 340
Sparkill, NY 10976

Coyle, James

From: Andrew Harwell [drewharwell@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 12:27 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Andrew Harwell
2238 Wellesley Street
2238 Wellesley Street
Palo Alto, CA 94306

Coyle, James

From: Theodore Bosen [ted@bosenlaw.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 12:10 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Theodore Bosen
69 Janebar Circle
Plymouth, MA 02360

Coyle, James

From: Jo Hamby [johamby2@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 12:08 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jo Hamby
P.O. Box 812
2240 Willivee Pl.
Pine Lake, GA 30072

Coyle, James

From: Sharon Rose [laguna_sharona@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:50 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Sharon Rose
520 Pine St. #30
Goleta, CA 93117

Coyle, James

From: Uphoria Blackham [hankim@cox.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Uphoria Blackham
Lobo Place
Albuquerque, NM 87106

Coyle, James

From: Amanda Mardon [amanda@fieldstudy.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:29 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Amanda Mardon
901 Mission Canyon Rd.
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Coyle, James

From: Paula Allmaras [p_allmaras@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Paula Allmaras
1932 Ashland Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55104

Coyle, James

From: Gloria Morrison [gloriaje@classicnet.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:23 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Gloria Morrison
1709 W. Jackson Blv.
Pecos, TX 79772

Coyle, James

From: Dorothy Varellas [djvarellas@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:23 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Dorothy Varellas
none
35 Carr st
35 Carr st
San Francisco, CA 94124

Coyle, James

From: Deborah Lyons [basilissa1@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Deborah Lyons
326 W Withrow St apt 1
Oxford, OH 45056-1181

Coyle, James

From: Deborah Lyons [basilissa1@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Deborah Lyons
326 W Withrow St apt 1
Oxford, OH 45056-1181

Coyle, James

From: andrea lieberman [aliebe9817@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms andrea lieberman
coalition against nukes
415 seven ponds towd rd
pob 611
watermill, NY 11976

Coyle, James

From: Rhonda Hungerford [rshungerford@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Rhonda Hungerford
8523 sextant Dr
8523 Sextant Dr
Baldwinsville, NY 13027

Coyle, James

From: Vicki Ferguson [vickilynnferguson@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Vicki Ferguson
7117 Garland Avenue
Takoma Park, MD 20912-6421

Coyle, James

From: Roberta Schonemann [schonem@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Roberta Schonemann
4515 Erwin Road
West Lafayette, IN 47906

Coyle, James

From: Carrie Staton [csstaton@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Carrie Staton
10226 Empire Grade
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Coyle, James

From: Ronit Corry [ronit@worldshare.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Ronit Corry
Ronit Corry
3956 Calle Cita
3956 Calle Cita
Santa Barbara, CA 93110

Coyle, James

From: Kelly Garbato [kelly.garbato@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:26 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kelly Garbato
147 SE 260th ST
Plattsburg, MO 64477

Coyle, James

From: Judith Stern [judyinlongbeach@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:23 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Judith Stern

Los Osos, CA 93402

Coyle, James

From: Stephen Damko [spd060172@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:21 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Stephen Damko
6942 E. Winding Oak Dr.
Middleburg Heights, OH 44130

Coyle, James

From: Cecilie Davidson [tigers@islandnet.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Cecilie Davidson
Int'l Year of the Tiger Fdn
4-1365 Rockland Ave
Silverdale, WA
Victoria, BC V8S 1V7

Coyle, James

From: Chaz Groves [chazeg@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Chaz Groves
2050 Dovedale Avenue
Cambria, CA 93428

Coyle, James

From: Roger Santerre [rsanterre@hvc.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Roger Santerre
none
10 Canaan Rd.
New Paltz, NY 12561

Coyle, James

From: stephen ludwig [deathdevelopment@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

none stephen ludwig
green party of san juan county
459 Aleck Bay Rd.
459 aleck bay road
Lopez Island, WA 98261

Coyle, James

From: Lance Michel [nabalom007@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:30 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Grand Poobah Lance Michel
60 Wayne St
Apt #1
Jersey City, NJ 07302

Coyle, James

From: Allan Widmeyer [arwidmeyer@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:22 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Allan Widmeyer
None
3281 Hilltop Dr.
Ventura, CA 93003-1059

Coyle, James

From: Rickey Westbrooks [rickywestbrooks@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:21 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Rickey Westbrooks
100 College Ave., Apt. #8
Centerville, TN 37033

Coyle, James

From: r reyes [msrreyesft@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

r reyes
9545 cerro remula
po box 686, avila beach, ca. 93424
san luis obispo, CA 93405

Coyle, James

From: Anne marvin [anne_marvin@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:17 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Anne marvin
117 Ramunno Circle
anne-marvin@msn.com
Hockessin, DE 19707

Coyle, James

From: Kathryn Bownass [kathrynbownass@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:05 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kathryn Bownass
3341 Brittan Ave.
#6
San Carlos, CA 94070

Coyle, James

From: Amanda Walton-Lopez [mandaflies@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Amanda Walton-Lopez
12514 Aubreywood Ln
12514 Aubreywood Ln
Houston, TX 77070

Coyle, James

From: Don Smith [dreamers2it@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr Don Smith
self
POB
POB
Piermont, NH 03779

Coyle, James

From: Peggy Vrana [earthsea@earthseapottery.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Peggy Vrana
1445 Norton Lane
Cambria, CA 93428

Coyle, James

From: Natalie Houghton [tallyho4617@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is completely unacceptable.

Specifically, the NRC's draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016 says (on page 5) that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

NOT SO!--the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is not just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation were to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? Also, given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, wouldn't a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For far too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Natalie Houghton
Woods Trl
Prescott, AZ 86305

Coyle, James

From: April Mondragon [etatinum@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

April Mondragon
HCR 74 Box 22201
Hc 74
El Prado, NM 87529

Coyle, James

From: Stephanie Frost [gsfrosty@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Stephanie Frost
127 Fallis Rd
127 Fallis Rd
Columbus, OH 43214

Coyle, James

From: Bonnie Johnson [bigred150@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:33 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Bonnie Johnson
retired
150 Thompson 3A
150 Thompson St New York NY
New York, NY 10012

Coyle, James

From: Molly Brown [MollyYBrown@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Molly Brown
722 Meadow Ave
Mt Shasta, CA 96067

Coyle, James

From: Rael McGinnis [missrael@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Rael McGinnis
2044 2nd St
Napa, CA 94559

Coyle, James

From: Eileen Chieco [ekchieco@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Eileen Chieco
1000 Frank Hill Rd
none
Ashland, OR 97520

Coyle, James

From: Barbara Tombleson [bjt@coho.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Barbara Tombleson
none
7526 SW Capitol Hill Rd.
7526 SW Capitol Hill Rd.
Portland, OR 97219-2640

Coyle, James

From: Barbara Carr [barbca@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Barbara Carr
self
8020 Bradshaw Road
Kingsville, MD 21087

Coyle, James

From: Barbara Walrafen [barbarawalrafen@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

-- Barbara Walrafen

--

P.O.Box 3217
none
Prescott, AZ 86302

Coyle, James

From: Linda Paleias [swordbrush@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Linda Paleias
502 w. 47 street
502 w. 47 street
New York City, NY 10036--226

Coyle, James

From: Vicki Johnson [vjohnson@kc.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Vicki Johnson
10735 Spruce Ave.
Kansas City, MO 64137

Coyle, James

From: David Houseman [davidhouseman199@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

David Houseman
211 East South Street
211 East South Street
Grand Ledge, MI 48837

Coyle, James

From: Judith Zingher [juzing@juno.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Judith Zingher
40 Winthrop Ave
Elmsford, NY 10523

Coyle, James

From: Robert Cherwink [r_cherwink@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Robert Cherwink
528 Joaquin Drive
Sonoma, CA 95476

Coyle, James

From: Kleomichele Leeds [kleomichele@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kleomichele Leeds
4411 Spicewood Springs
471
Austin, TX 78759-8577

Coyle, James

From: Amy Lake [amymlake@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Amy Lake
22 Meadow St
22 Meadow St
Lakeville, CT, CT 06039

Coyle, James

From: Phyllis Arist [lesmotsdujour@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Phyllis Arist
945 Ridge
Evanston, IL 60202-1719

Coyle, James

From: Chris Worcester [chris@solarwindworks.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:33 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Chris Worcester
Solar Wind Works
PO Box 2511
16713 Greenlee Road 96161
Truckee, CA 96160

Coyle, James

From: David Gascon [gpadavid@kingcon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:31 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. David Gascon
North Country Coalition for Justice & Peace PO Box 1597 PO Box 1597 Lyndonville, VT 05851

Coyle, James

From: Aurelia Gasher [rheabop@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:30 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Aurelia Gasher
Personal
810 Rayford Rd.
Apt. 1802
Spring, TX 77386

Coyle, James

From: Peter Anderson [anderson@recycleworlds.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Peter Anderson
313 Price Place #14
5749 Bittersweet Place
Madison, WI 53705

Coyle, James

From: Don Richardson [gaia@comporium.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now. We've had ENOUGH! Your decisions are sacrificing a future for your own family! Nuclear energy, weapons and the NRC must become obsolete NOW!

Dr. Don Richardson
PSR
577 Windover Drive
Brevard, NC 28712-9383

Coyle, James

From: Tim Paez [tim.paez@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Tim Paez
1470 48th Ave #5
1470 48th Ave #5, San Francisco, CA
San Francisco, CA 94122

Coyle, James

From: Kathleen Burke [kathleenmariaburke@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Kathleen Burke
Self
228 Chama ne
228 Chama ne
Albuquerque, NM 87108

Coyle, James

From: Fred Frank [pff9@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Fred Frank
Mother's For Peace
3615 Ardilla Rd.
Atascadero, CA 93422

Coyle, James

From: Phyllis Miller [phylmil14@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Phyllis Miller
2394 Leafgate Rd
Decatur, GA 30033

Coyle, James

From: Edmond Malone [edmalone1215@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Edmond Malone
4 Locust Ave. E.
4 locust ave
West Harrison, NY 10604

Coyle, James

From: Antonia Matthew [antonia.matthew@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Antonia Matthew
1307 S. Grant St.
Bloomington, IN 47401-5867

Coyle, James

From: Paul Meyer [pdmeyer2@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Paul Meyer
7845 Terrace Drive
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Coyle, James

From: Helen Russo [h_art4art@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Helen Russo
2629 Marion
Denver, CO 80205

Coyle, James

From: JERRY WHEELER [born2hike@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

JERRY WHEELER
13356 35th ave s
15723 1ST AVE S
TUKWILA, WA 98168

Coyle, James

From: Eric Hoyer [ehoyer@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Eric Hoyer
704 NW Eagle Ridge
Lee's Summit, MO 64081-4005

Coyle, James

From: Dr. Gerson Lesser [gtl1@nyu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Prof. Dr. Gerson Lesser
NYU School of Medicine
5800 Arlington Ave.
Bronx, NY 10471

Coyle, James

From: Yolanda White [pdsnickles@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Yolanda White
American 99ers Union
9725 Charnock Ave. Apt. 22
9725 Charnock Ave. Apt. 22, LA, CA 90034 L.A., CA 90034

Coyle, James

From: Liz Wally [elizawally@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Liz Wally
5528 Victor
Dallas, TX 75214-5055

Coyle, James

From: Nikoli McCracken [tursiops@cccomm.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:33 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Nikoli McCracken
Interested citizen
1060 Lee Ave.
No. 30
Fallon, NV 89406

Coyle, James

From: Thomas Koven [kombi3@embarqmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:26 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr Thomas Koven
Musconetcong Mountain Conservancy
507 charlestown road
507 charlestown rd
Hampton, NJ 08827-2543

Coyle, James

From: The Skutches Family [skutches.family@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. The Skutches Family
17685 Route 5 Rd.
17625 Rt. 5 Rd.
Sonora, CA 95370

Coyle, James

From: Cathie Schneider [ozarkotter@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Cathie Schneider
HC 2 Box 363
HC 2 Box 363
Squires, MO 65755

Coyle, James

From: Anne Askren [mimimom@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Anne Askren
156 Wakefield Drive
Athens, GA 30605-4382

Coyle, James

From: Jeffrey Schultz [jefschultz@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jeffrey Schultz
P.O. Box 151
P.O. Box 151 Gualala 95445
Gualala, CA 95445

Coyle, James

From: Norma Keim [nrkeim@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:00 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Norma Keim

South Berwick, ME 03908

Coyle, James

From: Ellen E Barfield [ellene4pj@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 4:50 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to PROTECT the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ellen E Barfield
814 Powers St
Baltimore, MD 21211-2510

Coyle, James

From: Lakshmi Hackett [lakshmi4art@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 4:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lakshmi Hackett
3251 E Maplewood Ct
Centennial, CO 80121

Coyle, James

From: Henry Jones [sphjones@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 4:38 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Henry Jones
1000 Urlin Avenue
Unit#1209
Columbus, OH 43212

Coyle, James

From: hilary malyon [hmalyon@mindspring.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 4:31 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mrs hilary malyon
seminole ave
96 seminole ave
07436, NJ 07436

Coyle, James

From: Katharine Tussing [kathytussing@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 4:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Katharine Tussing
148 Crestwood Ave
Apt. 11
Buffalo, NY 14216

Coyle, James

From: Mark Reback [mark@consumerwatchdog.org]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 4:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mark Reback
1606 N. Avenue 55
Los Angeles, CA 90042-1107

Coyle, James

From: dinda evans [dindamcp4@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 4:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

dinda evans
Teacher
pob 178695
san diego, CA 92117-3819

Coyle, James

From: Marcia Halligan [cocoon@mwt.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 4:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC drags its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it moves ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This does not serve the American people.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations as to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations should be to protect the public health and safety.

This means more than just semantics, If the purpose of NRC regulation would be to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? Given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government placed the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this meant favoring nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Marcia Halligan
Kickapoo Peace Circle
S 4001 River Road
Viroqua, WI 54665/8121

Coyle, James

From: michael guyette [nomadmic@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr michael guyette
Good people
1100 whitehead st
1100 Whitehead st.
Key West, FL 33040

Coyle, James

From: nancy nolan [nancy.nolan@cox.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. nancy nolan
225 west mariposa
san clemente, CA 92672

Coyle, James

From: Alexander Matheson [alexandermatheson@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Alexander Matheson
n/a
53 Hubbard St
n/a
Concord, MA 01742

Coyle, James

From: Amy Gustin [amyacorneater@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Amy Gustin
P.O. Box 2301
Redway, CA 95560

Coyle, James

From: John Hardin [tincanluminary@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

John Hardin
P.O. Box 2301
Redway, CA 95560

Coyle, James

From: Rochelle Rubin [shellsir@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Rochelle Rubin
72 Greenhills Rd
72 Greenhills Rd
Huntington Station, NY 11746

Coyle, James

From: Peter Burkard [pmborganic@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Peter Burkard
7614 Linden Lane
Sarasota, FL 34243

Coyle, James

From: Maureen burley [maureenb@redwing.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Maureen burley
W9972 290th Ave
W9972 290th Ave
Hager City, WI 54014

Coyle, James

From: Delaine Spilsbury [mssquaw@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MS Delaine Spilsbury
Bristlecone Alliance
P O Box 1055
4791 E Kalamazoo Rd, Ely NV
McGill, NV 89318

Coyle, James

From: James Wilhelmi [morocco1957422@netscape.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:31 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

James Wilhelmi
5552 E. Erin Ave.
5552 E. Erin Ave.
Fresno, CA 93727

Coyle, James

From: Herb Gartsman [hpgartsman@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:30 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr. Herb Gartsman
RETIRED
21212 Blue Curl Way
21212 Blue Curl Way
Canyon Country, CA 91351/2301

Coyle, James

From: Marcus Borgman [mb9905@sonic.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:28 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Marcus Borgman
2515 Westberry Drive
2515 Westberry Drive
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Coyle, James

From: Leslie Okladek [lseff@gracelinks.org]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:22 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Leslie Okladek
4 park ave nyc, ny
ny, NY 10016-5300

Coyle, James

From: Martha & Leon Goldin [honmgret@charter.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

We are shocked at the NRC's latest "head it the sand" approach to what is supposed to be their statutory role. the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications. At the same time it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Judge (ret) & Mr Martha & Leon Goldin
PO BOX 6007
LOS OSOS, CA 93412

Coyle, James

From: Zara Zsido [zarawithazee@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:15 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Zara Zsido
individual
Greenwich Street
Boston, MA 02120

Coyle, James

From: Karen Watkins [katusha@main.nc.us]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:08 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Karen Watkins
First Presbyterian Church
201 Sang Branch Rd
201 sang Branch Rd
Burnsville, NC, NC 28714

Coyle, James

From: Lionel Ortiz [brownbuffalo@suddenlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Lionel Ortiz
none
2820 Graham Rd
none
Bayside, CA 95524

Coyle, James

From: Karen Riffenburgh [dappledmountains@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Karen Riffenburgh

Arroyo grande, CA 93420

Coyle, James

From: Annie Pick [pickannie@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Annie Pick
Individual
6 Monarch Trace Ct. #305
6 Monarch Trace Ct., Chesterfield, MO 63017 Chesterfield, MO 63017

Coyle, James

From: BETTY N Bunch [b-bunch@oh.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. BETTY N Bunch
35016 Halsey Drive
Eastlake, OH 44095

Coyle, James

From: gale sheflin [sheflin@suddenlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Gale Shefli gale sheflin
self
2979 springer drive
2979 Springer Drive
mckinleyville, CA 95519-7504

Coyle, James

From: Elenita Hinds [elenita.hinds@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Elenita Hinds
Elenita Hinds
524 Sandy Lane
524 Sandy Lane Libertyville, IL 60048
Libertyville, IL 60048

Coyle, James

From: Kiilani Ocean [kiilani36@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Kiilani Ocean
Live within 20 miles of San Onofre
88 Pine
none
Encinitas, CA 92024

Coyle, James

From: g simpson [drgsimpson@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

scientist g simpson
retired
p.o. box 1551
p.o. box 1551 thousand oaks ca
thousand oaks, CA 91358

Coyle, James

From: Robert Janusko [janusko@rcn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Robert Janusko
1329 Eaton Ave
Bethlehem, PA 18018

Coyle, James

From: g simpson [drgsimpson@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

scientist g simpson
retired
p.o. box 1551
p.o. box 1551 thousand oaks ca
thousand oaks, CA 91358

Coyle, James

From: Deborah Lyons [basilissa1@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Deborah Lyons
326 W Withrow St apt 1
Oxford, OH 45056-1181

Coyle, James

From: Catherine Kandefer-Lang [mbyd@ymail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr Catherine Kandefer-Lang
11 Island Bay Circle
Guilford, CT 06437

Coyle, James

From: donna green [donna.green@portlandoregon.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:33 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

donna green
15497 nw westbrook
1120 sw 5th ave
portland, OR 97229

Coyle, James

From: Rich Yurman [ryurman@newsguy.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:30 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr Rich Yurman
retired
2516 24th Ave
2516 24th Ave
Oakland, CA 94618

Coyle, James

From: Eric Ranvig [EricRanvig@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:30 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Eric Ranvig
65 School St.
65 School St.
Acton, MA 01720

Coyle, James

From: Eve Muir [evemuir@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:27 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Retired Eve Muir
none
920 Delachaise St.
none
New Orleans, LA 70115

Coyle, James

From: carol maghakian [carol.maghakian@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:25 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs carol maghakian
6457 Sweet Gum Trail
6
myrtle Beach, SC 29588-6440

Coyle, James

From: diane crummett [dyanalake@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:22 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

rev. diane crummett
12 dogwood, p.o. box 1047
p.o. box 1047
soap lake, WA 98851

Coyle, James

From: Marl Feldman [happeemark@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation.
THIS IS UNNACCEPTABLE..

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is **TO PROTECT** the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been **PUTTING THE INTERESTS OF LARGE CORPORATIONS AHEAD OF THE PUBLIC'S INTERESTS.**

In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. **THIS MUST STOP..IMMEDIATELY**

Marl Feldman
137 Winchester Dr
137 Winchester Dr
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Coyle, James

From: Christopher McMullen [chris_mcmullen_@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Christopher McMullen
400 Nelson Street, #D
XXX
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420

Coyle, James

From: Sandy Stites [sandyatducks@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

I have been informed that, despite the Fukushima disaster, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is attempting to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

However, as you know, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

If the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever tried to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

I believe that for too long, the U.S. government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. Please do everything in your power to change this NOW! Thank you.

Mrs. Sandy Stites
Women's International League for Peace & Freedom
207 W. Anapamu #A
None
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93101

Coyle, James

From: Heleln Lederer [helen.lederer@cox.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: It troubles me that we don't hear anything anymore what is being done with Nuclear waste. Is that being kept from the public?

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Heleln Lederer
Retired
6199 E Broadway Blvd
#234
Tucson, AZ 85711

Coyle, James

From: Michael Hill [MikeHill@netscape.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Michael Hill
5719 Harpers Farm Road Unit C
Columbia, MD 21044

Coyle, James

From: pati philbrook [pstrouss@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms. pati philbrook
self
1937 Prairie Circle
1937 prairie circle
Fairfield, IA 52556

Coyle, James

From: Neal Ferris [naturalreligion@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Neal Ferris
24 Woodridge Road
24 Woodridge Road, Durham 03824
Durham, NH 03824

Coyle, James

From: Freedom Ventre [jv3free@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Freedom Ventre
700 shumont rd
Black Mountain, NC 28711

Coyle, James

From: Stephen Nickels [snickels@shawneelink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Stephen Nickels
2880 Trigg Tower
2880 Trigg Tower
Simpson, IL 62985

Coyle, James

From: Klaus Schumann [jayklaus@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

The NRC is by law not an enabler but a regulator of the nuclear industry. So, please, regulate! My wife and I are therefore in total agreement with the text below.

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Sincerely

Mary Jane Adams and Klaus Schumann
Paso Robles, CA 93446

Klaus Schumann
San Luis Obispo GREEN Party
26 Hillcrest Drive
Paso Robles, CA 93446

Coyle, James

From: Mary Lu Kelley [mkelley323@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Mary Lu Kelley
self
P. O. Box 289
P. O. Box 289
Lawai, HI 96765

Coyle, James

From: Mark Nolan [mnstretch@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Mark Nolan
Himself
6517 Zimmerman NE
6517 Zimmerman NE Albuquerque, NM
Albuquerque, NM 87110

Coyle, James

From: Thomas Garasic [tomasgarasic@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:49 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Thomas Garasic
9406 King George Dr.
Manassas, VA 20109
Manassas, VA 20109

Coyle, James

From: Ran Zirasri [hawkins_j_m@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ran Zirasri
423 W Century Ave. Apt. 201
Bismarck, ND 58503

Coyle, James

From: John Witter [digh@juno.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MR. John Witter
12 Edgewood Dr
32 Orchard Hts
New Paltz, NY 12561

Coyle, James

From: John Witter [digh@juno.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MR. John Witter
12 Edgewood Dr
32 Orchard Hts
New Paltz, NY 12561

Coyle, James

From: David Audette [daudette66@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. David Audette
33100 Freds Row Lane
Saint Helens, OR 97051

Coyle, James

From: Marlon Eiseman [budeiseman@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Marlon Eiseman
2518 Castillo st
2518 Castillo st
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Coyle, James

From: marci de sart [mjdesart@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

marci de sart
183 paradise marsh circle
183 nParadise Marsh Circle
brunswick, GA 31525

Coyle, James

From: Jeff Tangel [jeff.tangel@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Jeff Tangel
South Cook Environmental Action
2028 W. 101 PL
Chicago, IL 60643

Coyle, James

From: Fred Sokolow [sokolowmusic@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:25 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Fred Sokolow
1817 Hill St.
Santa Monica, CA 90405-5017

Coyle, James

From: Jordan Yeatts [jjoorrrdaann@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:23 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Jordan Yeatts
14438 Seven Hills Rd.
Traverse City, MI 49686

Coyle, James

From: Donna Blue [drblue@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:20 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Donna Blue
8 Manchester Lane
Elmhurst, IL 60126-3969

Coyle, James

From: Susan Singh [sukising@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Susan Singh
N/A
1762 E 60th St
1762 E 60th St
Tulsa, OK 74105

Coyle, James

From: Stephen Ekholm [ekholm33@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Reverend Stephen Ekholm
none
6290 Eagle Harbor Dr. NE
6290 Eagle Harbor Dr. NE, Bainbridge Island WA 98110 bainbridge island, WA 98110

Coyle, James

From: Mallika Henry [mallikahenry@mac.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Mallika Henry
individual
18 Broad St.
Cambridge, NY 12816

Coyle, James

From: Tom Keough [keoughnorgren@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:16 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Tom Keough
303A 16th Street
Bklyn., NY 11215-5504

Coyle, James

From: Mark M Giese [m.mk@att.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mark M Giese
none
1520 Bryn Mawr Ave
1520 Bryn Mawr Ave
Racine, WI 53403

Coyle, James

From: Dylan Huber [dylanhuber@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dylan Huber
USA
1622 11th street
Oakland, CA 94607

Coyle, James

From: Aurora Craig-McBride [chickenlady57@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Aurora Craig-McBride

Ranchos de Taos, NM 87557

Coyle, James

From: Juliette Hedgecock [azaleadale@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Juliette Hedgecock
591 Caves Camp Road
Williams, OR 97544

Coyle, James

From: Christine Abbott [abbotc1@laroche.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Christine Abbott
La Roche College
1009 Milton St.
1009 Milton St.
Pittsburgh, PA 15218

Coyle, James

From: Mary Wellington [mary@wellingtonfarm.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety, not to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mary Wellington
8682 N. Morning View Dr.
Tucson, AZ 85704

Coyle, James

From: Jeff Brown [jlucero@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:06 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Rev. Jeff Brown
ulc
po box 818
po box 818 felton, ca 95018
Felton, CA 95018

Coyle, James

From: Deb Harris [trailflyer@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Deb Harris

Floyd, VA 24091

Coyle, James

From: Anne Dugaw [adugaw@pacbell.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Anne Dugaw
385 Ogle Street #C
385 Ogle St # C
Costa Mesa, CA 92627

Coyle, James

From: John Gifford [john.gifford1@netzero.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr John Gifford
5397 N. sunriseview
5397 n. sunriseview
Star, ID 83669

Coyle, James

From: Mark Kennedy [iml@shasta.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mark Kennedy
300 South A St
300 S A St
MT SHASTA, CA 96067

Coyle, James

From: Richard Luke [dickandjo@mindspring.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Richard Luke
dickandjo@mindspring.com
11911 Hilltop Dr.
11911 Hilltop Dr.
Los Altos Hills, CA 94024-5214

Coyle, James

From: cara Cruickshank [storydanz@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

cara Cruickshank
po box 647
phoenicia, NY 12464

Coyle, James

From: Henriette Groot, PhD [hplgroot@kcbx.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr Henriette Groot, PhD
San Luis OBISPO
1940 Tapidero Ave
1000 Montecito Rd
Los Osos, CA 93402

Coyle, James

From: charles clark [cclark44@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

charles clark
5450 Kelly Rd
Find a waste solution B4 more nuke plants!
Flint, MI 48504

Coyle, James

From: Hans von Briesen [hsvonbriesen@cybermesa.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:32 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Hans von Briesen
208 Sereno Drive
208 Sereno Drive
Santa Fe, NM 87501-1536

Coyle, James

From: Leon Trumpp [aquatek@iland.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:32 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MR Leon Trumpp
Aqua Tek LLC
1703 W 9th
1703 W 9th
Sedalia, MO 65301

Coyle, James

From: Carol Childers [carolness101@mac.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:32 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Carol Childers
IND
3843 Center Ave
3843 Center Ave
Santa Barbara, CA 93110, CA 93110

Coyle, James

From: Thomas Roby IV [tomrobby@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:29 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Thomas Roby IV
1130 S Michigan Ave
2304
Chicago, IL 60605

Coyle, James

From: Deb Gee [dinkydeb06-artist@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:26 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Deb Gee
Peace on Earth, Save the Planet
1234 Any Street
1234 Nobusiness Street
Culver city, CA 90232

Coyle, James

From: suzi young [suziyoung@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms. suzi young
350 drakesview dr.
box 68
inverness, CA 94937

Coyle, James

From: Janet E. Smith [jes83144@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Janet E. Smith
n/a
11211 55 Avenue
11211 55 Avenue
Edmonton, AB T6H0W9

Coyle, James

From: Dennis Lane [nitrox3@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:22 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Dennis Lane
140 Wagon Wheel Lane
140 Wagon Wheel Ln.
Cutchogue, NY 11935

Coyle, James

From: Paul Hogu [paul10234@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:21 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

NUREG-1614, Vol. Paul Hogu
1023 E Appleton St Apt 4
1023 E Appleton St Apt 4
Long Beach, CA 90802-3435

Coyle, James

From: G Burton & family [gcb@fivesistersproductions.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:21 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

G Burton & family
4361 Liberty Road
4361 Liberty Road
Delaware, OH 43015

Coyle, James

From: Hartson Doak [hartson.doak@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:20 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Hartson Doak
Nuclear QC Inspectors
96226 Waiawa Rd #43
96266 Waiawa Rd #43
Pearl City, HI 96782

Coyle, James

From: Carl Kalisvaart [carlthethird@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Carl Kalisvaart
St. Edwards University
3300 Parker Ln
APT 142
Austin, TX 78741

Coyle, James

From: Jeanene Bergeron [J9Bergeron@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jeanene Bergeron
1135 Wenonah Avenue
Oak Park, IL 60304

Coyle, James

From: Walter Reece [wreeceyog@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:15 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Walter Reece
37 Deer Ridge Road
Wimbelley, TX 78676

Coyle, James

From: Susie Petra [susieqjaguar1969@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Susie Petra
retired
2011 Duff
2011 Duff Avenue
Ames, IA 50010

Coyle, James

From: Melissa Atkinson [melissa@ballroomdancers.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Melissa Atkinson
10647 Ashby Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Coyle, James

From: Gaylen Stirton [gstirton@gibsondunn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:08 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Gaylen Stirton
Nuclear Information and Resource Service
1319 El Centro Avenue
1319 El Centro Avenue
OAKLAND, CA 94602-1817

Coyle, James

From: Amie King [amie.king@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Amie King
8059 E. Vassar Dr.
Denver, CO 80231-7621

Coyle, James

From: natalina giugni [giugni@optonline.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:05 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

natalina giugni
71 west dorsey lane
71 west dorsey lane
hyde park, NY 12538

Coyle, James

From: Mary Anne Muller [brooklynbluebird@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs Mary Anne Muller
2012 Haring St
Brooklyn, NY 11229-4016

Coyle, James

From: Phyllis M Andrews [pmandrews@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Phyllis M Andrews
None
101 E 16 St
#2M
New York, NY 10003-2128

Coyle, James

From: dora haslett [dprokope@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms. dora haslett
735 s. w. wst. clair
735 s. w. st. clair
portland, OR 97205

Coyle, James

From: Jimson Vincent [jimson.vincent@giant.cos.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:00 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Jimson Vincent
35294 Yokohl Valley Dr.
Exeter
Exeter, CA 93221

Coyle, James

From: Susan Hand [lasusanamano@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:58 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

I am part of that 99% that is frustrated and fed up with political favors to corporations. So I have to ask: What's with the attempt to redefine the principles of nuclear regulation to make it easier on the corporations and riskier for the citizens?

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety. For example, the NRC should implement necessary post-Fukushima safety modifications.

If the purpose of NRC regulation was to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Susan Hand
536 South 410 East
Kanab, UT 84741

Coyle, James

From: Harry and Kathy Brownfield [hbrown6905@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:54 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Harry and Kathy Brownfield
74 Acker Road
Newport, PA 17074

Coyle, James

From: Holly Kukkonen [hakukkonen@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:45 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Holly Kukkonen
1607 Burns Ave.
1607 Burns Ave.
Iowa City, IA 52240

Coyle, James

From: Barry Zuckerman [b_zuckerman@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:45 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Barry Zuckerman
1 Old anvil Lane
Middletown, NY 10940

Coyle, James

From: James Roberts [jimrobj@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:34 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr James Roberts
none
215 S Ellis St
Palouse, WA 99161

Coyle, James

From: Elizabeth Patten [tubby5759@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:34 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs Elizabeth Patten
self
65 Staniels Rd
65 Staniels Rd
Chichester, NH 03258

Coyle, James

From: leslie hamlin [lhamlin1976@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:33 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

leslie hamlin
270 Lakemoore Dr.
Atlanta, GA 30342

Coyle, James

From: Philip Simon [philsimtpr@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:31 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Philip Simon
Box 9473
San Rafael, CA 94912

Coyle, James

From: carol jagiello [cjags91@optonline.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:29 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms carol jagiello
91 wood pl
bloomingtondale, NJ 07403

Coyle, James

From: liz arizona [flagstaffliz@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:25 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

liz arizona
Codepink Anti nukes
1821 West Citrus Way
Phoenix, AZ 85015

Coyle, James

From: Chris O'Connor [cjo30080@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:18 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Chris O'Connor
2197 Berryhill Circle
2197 Berryhill Circle
Smyrna, GA 30082-4744

Coyle, James

From: H. Allan Aho [alaho@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:14 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. H. Allan Aho
4319 Sussex Avenue
4319 Sussex Ave.
Lake Worth, FL 33461

Coyle, James

From: John Peck [frisiard@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:10 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

John Peck
9 Hickory Lane
9 Hickory Lane
Higganum, CT 06441

Coyle, James

From: ed maestro [edjmaestro@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:09 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ed maestro
1101 rt 32
1101 rt 32
Rosendale, NY 12472

Coyle, James

From: Barbara Brigham [barbaramms@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:08 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Sister Barbara Brigham
150 E. Huntingdon St.
Philadelphia, PA 19125

Coyle, James

From: C E Blower [muscl_84@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:08 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

C E Blower
1520 Gregory St
San Diego, CA 92102

Coyle, James

From: lori weber [diversified8@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:03 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

lori weber
605 hale st.
hale st.
johnson city, TN 37601

Coyle, James

From: Mark Hinds [mark.hinds@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:58 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

(no title) Mark Hinds
(speaking as individual citizen)
524 Sandy Lane
524 Sandy Lane, Libertyville, IL
Libertyville, IL 60048-3554

Coyle, James

From: Michelle Hoff [hofmich22@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:57 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Michelle Hoff
NA
2413 Stony Garden Rd.
2413 Stony Garden Rd.
Kintnersville, PA 18930

Coyle, James

From: Charity Moschopoulos [charity.rome@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:54 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Charity Moschopoulos
3617 Sprucedale Dr
Annandale, VA 22003-1948

Coyle, James

From: Stephen and Robin Newberg [crashnewberg@netscape.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:53 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Stephen and Robin Newberg
146 Granville Rd
North Granby, CT 060601301

Coyle, James

From: mya garcia [antoy5ntoy@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:50 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mya garcia
21 river st
little ferry, NJ 07643

Coyle, James

From: Terri Keller [faith11@tds.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:48 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Terri Keller
self
P. O. Box 825
P. O. Box 835
Kingsland, GA 31548

Coyle, James

From: Lois Wise [lolo2@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:45 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lois Wise
22 Skylark Dr. #316
Larkspur, CA 94939

Coyle, James

From: Rikardo Jahnke [rif@countrysspeed.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:43 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Rikardo Jahnke
43188 Guthrie Rd.
43188 Guthrie Rd
Gays Mills, WI 54631

Coyle, James

From: Margaret Wright [mzwright@att.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:43 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Margaret Wright
retired
162 Brevoort Rd
162 Brevoort Rd., Columbus 43214
Columbus, OH 43214

Coyle, James

From: Elizabeth Cuprak [eecup@gwi.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:42 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Elizabeth Cuprak
none
75 Dresden Ave
Gardiner, ME 04345

Coyle, James

From: Elizabeth Cuprak [eecup@gwi.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:42 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Elizabeth Cuprak
none
75 Dresden Ave
Gardiner, ME 04345

Coyle, James

From: Linda Wilscam [lilprngcat@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:40 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Linda Wilscam
161 East Main St
Apt #12
Rockville, CT 06066

Coyle, James

From: Paul Hoekstra [paulhoek99@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:38 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

The relationship between the nuclear power industry and the NRC has long been recognized as one of sweetheart regulation. Get rid of the "enabling" language before we have a Fukushima here,

retired engineer Paul Hoekstra
retired
1021 Arlington Blvd. #1210
1021 Arlington Blvd., #1210
ARLINGTON, VA 22209

Coyle, James

From: Jeremiah O'Leary [joleary@xaverianbrothers.org]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:34 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

Brother Jeremiah O'Leary
Xaverian Brothers
738 S. Beechfield Ave.
Baltimore, MD 21229

Coyle, James

From: sara west [hiho989@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:17 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. sara west
individual
1420 Palm Street
1420 Palm Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Coyle, James

From: Valerie Rapport [vtrueblood@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:17 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Valerie Rapport
141 39th Ave. E.
Seattle, WA 98112

Coyle, James

From: Kenneth Bowman [kbowman@prodigy.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:16 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Kenneth Bowman
2838 Rivers End Road
Orlando, FL 32817

Coyle, James

From: Jackie Kennedy [toha328@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:14 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Jackie Kennedy
235 Quiet Oak Court
235 Quiet Oak Court
Davenport, FL 33896-6101

Coyle, James

From: Jean de Smet [j.desmet@att.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:11 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jean de Smet
39 Davis Street
na
Willimantic, CT 06226

Coyle, James

From: Beth Brenneman [storyteller2069@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:04 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Beth Brenneman
1051 Gilman Dr
1051 Gilman Dr
Broadmoor, CA 94015

Coyle, James

From: Stefanie Smith [stfgrl@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 10:04 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Stefanie Smith
111 grand view dr
toms river, NJ 08753

Coyle, James

From: Richard O'Donnell [odonnellwolfeboro@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:59 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr & Mrs Richard O'Donnell
private NO NUKES citizen
29 Middleton Road
Wolfeboro, NH 03894

Coyle, James

From: J. Dana Forbes [RedHawk1988@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:55 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

J. Dana Forbes
4037 N. Troy St.
4037 N. Troy St.
Chicago, IL 60618

Coyle, James

From: Denise Wilson [coloradotwin@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:54 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Denise Wilson
3 Bluff Rd
3 Bluff Rd., Williamsburg, CO 81226
Williamsburg, CO 81226

Coyle, James

From: John Flitcraft [jflitcraft@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:51 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

John Flitcraft
1812 Pineridge Dr
1660 Saint Thomas Ave
Cambria, CA 93428

Coyle, James

From: Nick Mantas Esq [nickmantas@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:50 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Nick Mantas Esq
372 Wilson Ave
Twp of Washington, NJ 07676-4736

Coyle, James

From: Robert Webster [zotlocker@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:49 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Robert Webster
7 Johnson lane
none
Oxford, MA 01540

Coyle, James

From: michael Rivard [microvard@clubdelf.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:49 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr michael Rivard
po box 185
jamaica plain, MA 02130

Coyle, James

From: Craig Warren [craigwarren@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:41 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Craig Warren
2159 Trower Ave.
Napa, CA 94558-2247

Coyle, James

From: Margaret Dunn [dunrovin20032003@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:40 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Margaret Dunn
W4009 12th Rd.
307 N. Rush St.
Montello, WI 53949

Coyle, James

From: Tom Hougham [annntom@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:39 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Tom Hougham
none
4001 W Hougham Rd
Trafalgar, IN 46181

Coyle, James

From: Claudia Greco [bukigreco@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:35 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Claudia Greco
1715 Hendrickson Street
1715 Hendrickson Street
Brooklyn, NY 11234-4317

Coyle, James

From: Sr. Sharon Zayac [jubilee.farm@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:28 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Sr. Sharon Zayac
6760 Old Jacksonville Road
New Berlin, IL 62670-6747

Coyle, James

From: HUNTER WALLOF [huntergatherer8@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:25 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MR HUNTER WALLOF
12340 SIR FRANCIS DRAKE BLVD.
UNIT A
POINT REYES STATION, CA 94956

Coyle, James

From: Eric Wessman [eric@ericwessman.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:24 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Eric Wessman
723 Pelhamdale Avenue
Pelham, NY 10803

Coyle, James

From: Majia Nadesan [majia@asu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:18 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr Majia Nadesan

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Coyle, James

From: marianne hunyer [2hunter@cox.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:17 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

Protecting future generations as well as citizens living today is the purpose of the NRC. Preventing poisoning our neighbours in the world is our responsibility.

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mrs marianne hunyer
cinnamon lane
rpy, CA 90275-5902

Coyle, James

From: emily chadbourne [echadbourne@triad.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:10 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms emily chadbourne
humanists of the world
707 longview st
707 longview st
greensboro, NC 27403-2018

Coyle, James

From: K Braun [kjb@braun@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:08 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop--
NOW!!!

K Braun
PO Box 110
Great Cacapon, WV 25422

Coyle, James

From: Marcie M Musser [marcieplus@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:08 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Marcie M Musser
SGI-USA
544 S Washington
544 s Washington
Mecosta, MI 49332

Coyle, James

From: Peter Broderson [Peterbroderson@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:07 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Peter Broderson
3865 Imaginary Rd.
3865 Imaginary Td TLH FL.
Tallahassee, FL 32309

Coyle, James

From: Mark Chafin [mactns@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:04 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Mark Chafin
191 Founders Ct
191 founders Ct
Gahanna, OH 43230-5076

Coyle, James

From: Dave Waugh [dw45575@AggieNetwork.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:04 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing urgent post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is instead moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Dave Waugh
915 Lazy Lane
San Marcos, TX 78666-9462

Coyle, James

From: Robert Robinson [robinson@main.nc.us]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:57 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Robert Robinson
US Citizen
34 Wall Street Suite 407
36 Morning Mist Lane
Asheville, NC 28801

Coyle, James

From: Barbara Silverstein [bjcsgms4@northpennaccess.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:56 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Barbara Silverstein
171 Benson Ave
Mansfield, PA 16933

Coyle, James

From: cynthia woods [sinywoo@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:54 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

cynthia woods
1258 marina dr
marina drive
siddell, LA 70458

Coyle, James

From: Patricia Marida [marida@wideopenwest.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:45 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Patricia Marida
Sierra Club
1710 Dorsetshire Rd.
Columbus, OH 43229-2165

Coyle, James

From: William Nusbaum [wfnusbaum@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:41 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

William Nusbaum
2916 Gettysburg Avenue South
Saint Louis Park, MN 55426

Coyle, James

From: Karen Jacobsen [kjacobsen2001@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:35 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Karen Jacobsen
N/A
3414 Rte. 150
Box 259
East Schodack, NY 12063

Coyle, James

From: Brian Skinner [skerticus@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:34 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Brian Skinner
154 Kristine Blvd
154 Kristine Blvd
Panama City, FL 32404

Coyle, James

From: Dorothy Anderson [gramdot@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:34 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs Dorothy Anderson
125 River St
No Weymouth, MA 02191

Coyle, James

From: Whitney Metz [whitneythedryad@vegemail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:30 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Whitney Metz
100 1/2 East Main Street
Mannington, WV 26582-1127

Coyle, James

From: Alice Andrews [andrewsa@newpaltz.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:22 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Alice Andrews
SUNY New Paltz
35 Tricor Ave
35 Tricor Ave
New Paltz, NY 12561

Coyle, James

From: Lyn Gottschalk [lynmari@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:20 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lyn Gottschalk
2350 Canter Ln Apt B
Apt B
Green Bay, WI 54304

Coyle, James

From: Fred Nadelman, LMSW [enabler2@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:15 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Fred Nadelman, LMSW
National Association of Social Workers
1825 East Gwinnett Street
1825 East Gwinnett Street
Savannah, GA 31404-1852

Coyle, James

From: David Ghostlaw [ghostdreams@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:14 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

David Ghostlaw
757 Hewitt Lane
New Windsor, NY 12553

Coyle, James

From: Julie Parisi Kirby [juliepkirby@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:13 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Julie Parisi Kirby
36 Purdy Hollow Road
...
Woodstock, NY 12498

Coyle, James

From: Dennis Ledden [lcs5779@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:02 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Dennis Ledden
14941 Trinidad Drive
Rancho Murieta, CA 95683-9451

Coyle, James

From: Jessica Cresseveur [jmcress@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:55 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jessica Cresseveur
2834 Charlestown Rd. #6
New Albany, IN 47150

Coyle, James

From: Bruce Stone [brucestone55@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:53 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Bruce Stone
ON the Liberal Edge
689 42nd Street
Des Moines, IA 50312

Coyle, James

From: kathy brown [kdharmsbrown@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:51 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

kathy brown
10755 winthrop
10755 winthrop
pinckney, MI 48169-9333

Coyle, James

From: Rebecca Poston [jarrettposton@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:47 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people.

Nuclear power is highly dangerous: from the mining, to the processing, to the generation of power, and to the disposal of waste. NRC's regulations are to protect public health and safety not to enable the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Rebecca Poston
23540 Old Meadow Lane
23540 Old Meadow Lane
Middleburg, VA 20117

Coyle, James

From: Audrey Clement [aclement65@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:42 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Green Party of V Audrey Clement
Co-Chair
5709 10th Road North #A
#A
Arlington, VA 22205

Coyle, James

From: Francine Tyler [ft5@nyu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:40 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Prof Francine Tyler
419 W. 48th Street Apt. 1E
New York, NY 10036

Coyle, James

From: Marguerite Benoit [mbenrn@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:35 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Marguerite Benoit
99 Evergreen Street
Providence, RI 02906

Coyle, James

From: roseann divicino [rdivicino@tampabay.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:33 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

roseann divicino
7528 High Pines Court
7528 High Pines Court
Port Richey, FL 34668

Coyle, James

From: sandra fabec [gailandsandy1@mac.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:31 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. sandra fabec
Individual
11543 clematis blvd
11543 Clematis Blvd.
pittsburgh, PA 15235

Coyle, James

From: ken hynson [anontrad@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 7:29 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ken hynson
127 strong av
127 strong av
syracuse, NY 13210

Coyle, James

From: David Ghostlaw [ghostdreams@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 8:14 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

David Ghostlaw
757 Hewitt Lane
New Windsor, NY 12553

Coyle, James

From: laura polant [floyddakini@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:53 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. laura polant
Artemis GIS
866 roger rd
floyd, VA 24091

Coyle, James

From: Paul Ordway [paulordway@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:50 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Paul Ordway
Pauloculture
1025 W 7th, #4
1025 W7th, #4
Eugene, OR 97402

Coyle, James

From: john egan [fright4knight@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:49 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr. john egan
55 may st
new rochelle, NY 10801

Coyle, James

From: Terry Andrews [terryhandrews@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:44 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Terry Andrews
1101 Carters Lane
1101 Carters Lane
Halifax, VA 24558

Coyle, James

From: Jeannie Finlay-Kochanowski [clannadocks@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:41 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jeannie Finlay-Kochanowski
229 Majestic Drive
Toledo, OH 43608

Coyle, James

From: Martha Izzo [marthalovesoso@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:41 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Martha Izzo
Kinney Creek
Evergreen, CO 80439

Coyle, James

From: Amy Perrin [akaroa614@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:29 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Amy Perrin
14 Cottage Street
14 Cottage Street
Claremont, NH 03743

Coyle, James

From: Henry Schwartzman [unhotmail@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:26 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Henry Schwartzman
32 E. First St.
32 E. First St.
Corning, NY 14830-2621

Coyle, James

From: juliet Pearson [julietjohns@mac.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 6:11 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Juliet johns juliet Pearson
18734 Bambi COurt
18734 bambi court
grass Valley, CA 95949

Coyle, James

From: Candy LeBlanc [canbowring@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:53 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Candy LeBlanc
4361 Turnbridge Drive
1
Sacramento, CA 95823

Coyle, James

From: John Liberty [john-liberty@att.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:43 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. John Liberty
5231 Carrington Street
Sacramento, CA 95819

Coyle, James

From: Frank X. Kleshinski [FX.Kleshinski@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:39 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Frank X. Kleshinski
Individual
209 North Drive
209 North Drive
Jeannette, PA 15644-9629

Coyle, James

From: Albert Ritchey, Jr. [si@mindspring.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:36 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Albert Ritchey, Jr.
2101 Cloud Croft Circle
Vestavia Hills, AL 35216

Coyle, James

From: JAY ROZNER [JAYROZ@BELLSOUTH.NET]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:18 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

JAY ROZNER
74 VENTNOR D
DEERFIELD BEACH, FL 334422445

Coyle, James

From: Richard Kramer [cinemabuff9@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:16 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Richard Kramer
Self
8505 S.W. 80th Pl.
8505 S.W. 80th Place
MIAMI, FL 33143

Coyle, James

From: James Bochenek [jbbob@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:14 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. James Bochenek
226 Diamond Hill Rd
Delmar, NY 12054

Coyle, James

From: shari zabriskie [shabbazabba@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:14 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

shari zabriskie
452 S. Main St.
452 s. main st. brattleboro, vt 05301
Brattleboro, VT 05301

Coyle, James

From: Laurence Kirby [vanini@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:05 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Laurence Kirby
36 Purdy Hollow Rd
Woodstock, NY 12498

Coyle, James

From: Erv Amdahl [eamdahl@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 5:02 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Erv Amdahl
5111 San Carlos
5111 San Carlos
Sierra Vista, AZ 85650

Coyle, James

From: Larry Pringle [larryeugene1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 4:54 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Larry Pringle
none
6479 Lone Peak Way
6479 Lone Peak Way
Las Vegas, NV 89156

Coyle, James

From: Jill Gabreau [jillgabscaf@sfr.fr]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 4:42 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Jill Gabreau
68 W 238 St
NY, NY 10463

Coyle, James

From: Spencer Selander [spencerselander@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 4:37 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Spencer Selander
PO Box 363
341 Pioneer Ave NE
Castle Rock, WA 98611-0363

Coyle, James

From: Julia Tawyea' [angelsluv@echoes.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 4:18 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Julia Tawyea'
N/A
PO Box 291
1933 Grandview Drive-The Hideout
Lake Ariel, PA 18436

Coyle, James

From: Carol Lapetino [carolandkj@att.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 4:18 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Carol Lapetino
6441 Loomes Ave.
6441 Loomes Ave.
Downers Grove, IL 60516

Coyle, James

From: Charles Neidich [cneidich@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 4:15 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Charles Neidich
200 Cabrini Blvd
200 Cabrini Blvd
New York, NY 10033

Coyle, James

From: andreas vlasiadis [avl5787@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 4:05 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

andreas vlasiadis
el.venizelou 53d
tavros-athens, ot 17778

Coyle, James

From: Karen Barton [astrique@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 4:02 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Coordinator Karen Barton
Bryn Mawr Peace Coalition
714 Old Lancaster Road
714 Old Lancaster Road
Bryn Mawr, PA 19010-3109

Coyle, James

From: Mark Marshall [toxic.earth@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:58 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Mr Mark Marshall
9022 SW 49th Ave
Portland, OR 97219

Coyle, James

From: Jason Bowman [xyamuchax@care2.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:58 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Jason Bowman
4361 Turnbridge Dr
Sacramento, CA 95823-1931

Coyle, James

From: David Sherman [ds Sherman.design@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:42 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

David Sherman
1923 Marin Dr
Santa Rosa, CA 95405

Coyle, James

From: Douglas Daetz [douglas.daetz@aya.yale.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:38 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on Nuclear Regulatory Commission NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

It was most distressing to learn today that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is seeking to change its mission from protecting the public health and safety to enabling the use of radioactive materials. How much have nuclear industry lobbyists been paying off members of the NRC? Please stop the NRC from making such a change in its mission. Please also make it implement needed post-Fukushima safety modifications to reactors and improvements to monitoring, control, and emergency response processes.

Time is of the essence because the NRC is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels. This is unacceptable. The purpose of NRC regulations must remain "to protect the public health and safety."

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Douglas Daetz
Self
1744 Karameos Drive
Sunnyvale, CA 94087-5226

Coyle, James

From: Candy LeBlanc [telvari9@care2.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:36 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Candy LeBlanc
4361 Turnbridge Dr
Sacramento, CA 95823-1931

Coyle, James

From: FREDDIE LONG [longfreddie@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:33 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MS FREDDIE LONG

none

24378 BIRCH DR
24378 BIRCH DR
WILLITS, CA 95490

Coyle, James

From: Keith Eagle [deradler43@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:28 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Keith Eagle
3817 Devonshire Dr
3817 Devonshire Dr.
Salisbury, MD 21804

Coyle, James

From: Dan&Val OConnell [dko@mac.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:28 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: The people know about these Comments on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Daniel OConnell Dan&Val OConnell
sane planet
PO Box 77
PO Box 77 Emigrant, Mt. 59027
Emigrant, MT 59027

Coyle, James

From: Robert brookshire [NWPABrookshire@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:25 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Robert brookshire
5407 NE 33rd Ave
5407 NE 33rd ave
Portland, OR 97211

Coyle, James

From: Corinne Salcedo [scorinne@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:20 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Corinne Salcedo
Retired
4303 Kingsway
4303 Kingsway
Anacortes, WA 98221-3287

Coyle, James

From: Chris Beal [chrisbeal76@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:19 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr Chris Beal
none
Old Post Office
Town St
Louth, TX 78040

Coyle, James

From: caroline good [sorelli364@dslextreme.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:17 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

caroline good
4230 1/4 Woodman Avenue, #3, Sherman Oaks, CA 91423-4374

Coyle, James

From: Michael Burt [michaelvirat@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:09 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr Michael Burt
505 13st SE
Washington, DC 20003

Coyle, James

From: Jack David Marcus [jackdavidm@nyc.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 3:07 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jack David Marcus
215 West 92nd Street Apt. 15E
New York City, NY 10025-7480

Coyle, James

From: Lorna Farnum [lorna.skip@gte.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:55 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Lorna Farnum
3305 Druid Ln.
3305 Druid Ln.
Rossmoor, CA 90720

Coyle, James

From: Kathleen Eaton [sce9590@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:51 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kathleen Eaton
PRIVATE CITIZEN
1035 Schagrin Drive
1035 Schagrin Dr.
Middletown, DE 19709

Coyle, James

From: Mary Ellen Hasbrouck [mehasbrouck@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:50 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Mary Ellen Hasbrouck
none
1301-B San Domar Dr
none
Mountain View, CA 94043

Coyle, James

From: David Gardner [dgardner@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:45 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

David Gardner
2525 Beverly Ave #8
Santa Monica, CA 90405-3764

Coyle, James

From: Ana Alvarez [aairis@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:21 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Ana Alvarez
11500 Brandiwine Ct.
Clermont, FL 34711-6451

Coyle, James

From: Edward Craig [epcraig@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:18 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Edward Craig
850 West Fifth Ave Apt 11
n/a
Eugene, OR 97402

Coyle, James

From: Katherine Nelson [chocchip17@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:14 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Katherine Nelson
4 Merion Avenue
Moorestown, NJ 08057

Coyle, James

From: Rhonda Davis [hening@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:09 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Rhonda Davis

Richmond, VA 23220

Coyle, James

From: John Kersting [johnkersting@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:07 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. John Kersting
JustUs Productions
2404 Olympia Ave NE
2404 Olympia Ave NE
Olympia, WA 98506-4845

Coyle, James

From: Susan Pyburn [susanimai@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 2:02 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Susan Pyburn
MOTHERS FOR P EACE
p.o. box 15509
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Coyle, James

From: Jane Rice [jandprice@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:58 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Jane Rice
9905 Belhaven Road
9905 Belhaven Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

Coyle, James

From: Margaret C. Smith [qataluna@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:48 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Margaret C. Smith
54 Fall Branch Lane
Murphy, NC 28906

Coyle, James

From: Margaret C. Smith [qataluna@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:48 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Margaret C. Smith
54 Fall Branch Lane
Murphy, NC 28906

Coyle, James

From: Donald Wallace [donwwallace@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:38 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Donald Wallace
Las Virgenes Homeowners Federation
1710 Cold Canyon Road
1710 Cold Canyon Road
Calabasas, CA 91302

Coyle, James

From: Ruth Koblenz [rh.koblenz@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:37 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Ruth Koblenz
5431 Mardel Avenue
St. Louis, MO 63109-1608

Coyle, James

From: Candace Stolley [info@bindujewelry.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:34 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Candace Stolley
24620 Morgan Valley Rd
Lower Lake, CA 95457

Coyle, James

From: Gladys Bryer [gnbryer@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:32 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Gladys N. B Gladys Bryer
550 Sheridan Square
Evanston, IL 60202

Coyle, James

From: Russell Hodin [at10uation@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:26 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Russell Hodin
60 Lurline St
1570 Hansen Lane, San Luis Obispo, CA
San Francisco, CA 94122

Coyle, James

From: Colin Loustalot [watermillvillage@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:25 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Colin Loustal Colin Loustalot
Student Sustainability Coalition
17 West Pueblo St
909 Bath St
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Coyle, James

From: Susan Shann [electricblue1119@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:19 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Susan Shann
4806 MichiganAve.
Nashville, TN 37209

Coyle, James

From: Lauryn Slotnick [halli620@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:17 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lauryn Slotnick
66th Ave.
Douglaston, NY 11362

Coyle, James

From: r Young [jock_y@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:13 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. r Young
206 W 5th St
Cle Elum, WA 98922

Coyle, James

From: Robin Durston [rdurston@macnexus.org]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:10 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Robin Durston
3801 43rd Ave.
Sacramento, CA 95824

Coyle, James

From: sundrar allen [sunathome@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:08 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms sundrar allen
human being
259 Wayne Ct
259 Wayne Ct
SALT LAKE CTY, UT 84101-1822

Coyle, James

From: Elaine Fischer [efischer@workmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:04 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Elaine Fischer
citizen
2514 Sharmar Rd.
Roanoke, VA 24018-2625

Coyle, James

From: Kevin Kalmes [klk83151@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:04 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Kevin Kalmes
3080 N Davlin Ct
Chicago, IL 60618

Coyle, James

From: James Sullivan [midknight6@lycos.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:03 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

James Sullivan
5509 W Higgins Ave
Chicago, IL 60630-2125

Coyle, James

From: Genevieve MacKinnon [healingchant@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:00 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Genevieve MacKinnon
826 Boulder Creek Lane
none
Ashland, OR 97520

Coyle, James

From: Paige Winslett [saguarokid@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:59 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

The purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety, not to enable the use of nuclear fuels.

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Paige Winslett
1543 N Plaza de Lirios
1543 N Plaza de Lirios
Tucson, AZ 85745-1666

Coyle, James

From: janice palma-glennie [palmtree7@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:58 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

Aloha,

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mahalo.

janice palma-glennie
pobox 4849
kailua-kona, HI 96740

Coyle, James

From: Mara Segal [mscd@humboldt1.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:57 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mara Segal
1068 Tenth St
Arcata, CA 95521

Coyle, James

From: Kristy Mitchell [harukahoneyh@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:54 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kristy Mitchell
730 W. Long
Stephenville, TX 76401

Coyle, James

From: Matthew Bennett [greenmachine75@optonline.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:52 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Matthew Bennett
Retired
20 Kirkwood Rd
Port Washington, NY 11050

Coyle, James

From: Thomas Gillespie [tgillespie@ca.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:51 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Thomas Gillespie
15272 Valeda Dr.
La Mirada, CA 90638-2440

Coyle, James

From: Sandra Woodall [lswoodall@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:46 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Sandra Woodall
118 Hermine Blvd.
San Antonio, TX 78212-1203

Coyle, James

From: Susan Quinones [susanqnns52@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:45 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

RN Susan Quinones
1228 Palm St B
1228 Palm St
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Coyle, James

From: Teresa Jaeger [iotlj@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:43 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Teresa Jaeger
248 E University Blvd, Apt A
Apt A
Melbourne, FL 32901-7042

Coyle, James

From: M. Joan Schultz [honey1076@juno.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:43 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

If NRC is serious about protecting the health and safety of our citizens, it would shut down the reactors and atomic areas.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people.

Ms. M. Joan Schultz
Democrat
770 Vivian St
770 Vivian St
Lakewood, CO 80401-4661

Coyle, James

From: Robert Handelsman [trtfmnlwr@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:42 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Robert Handelsman
2643 Central Park
2643 Central Park
Evanston, IL 60201

Coyle, James

From: Eric Boyce [Ericsb274@netzero.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:42 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? Given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop.

Mr Eric Boyce
NIRS
P.O. Box 274
P.O. Box 274
Hatboro, PA 19040-0274

Coyle, James

From: J. Holley Taylor [nukefree@htfarm.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:41 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

J. Holley Taylor
PO Box 1987
Penn Valley, CA 95946

Coyle, James

From: Peter Yelda [peteryelda@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:38 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

nrc must do it's Peter Yelda
just me
668 Branch St.
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Coyle, James

From: Carole Chowen [carole_chowen@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:37 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Carole Chowen
P.O. Box 2741
P.O. Box 2741
Grand Junction, CO 81502-2741

Coyle, James

From: Ricki Newman [rickinewman@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:36 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ricki Newman
617 Prince Dr.
Newburgh, IN 47630

Coyle, James

From: Ron & Nancy Saeger [rnsaeger@cableone.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:34 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ron & Nancy Saeger
Red River Veterans For Peace
1217 Oak St N
1217 Oak St N
Fargo, ND 58102-2706

Coyle, James

From: Eloise Engman [pualeafarm@hawaiiintel.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:29 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Eloise Engman
22 Auoli Drive
22 Auoli Drive
Makawao, HI 96768

Coyle, James

From: John Keiser [jlkck@nyc.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:28 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. John Keiser
410 East 6 St., Apt. 17B
New York, NY 10009

Coyle, James

From: Duane Welsch [duannewelsch@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:26 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet on implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is trying to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

In its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

If the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Thank you for your work to protect the public interest..

Ms. Duane Welsch
619 Alden Road
619 Alden Road
Claremont, CA 91711

Coyle, James

From: Anne Weiss [likapika@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:22 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Anne Weiss
7320 SE. Mill St.
7320 SE Mill Stret
Portland, OR 97215

Coyle, James

From: Julie Smith [raynjulie1048@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:21 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Julie Smith
1048 Bay Oaks Drive
Los Osos, CA 93402

Coyle, James

From: Kristine Andarmani [k_andarmani@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:20 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Thank you.

Kristine Andarmani
19616 Ladera Ct.
Saratoga, CA 95070

Coyle, James

From: Patti Davis [valhala@cox.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:19 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mom Patti Davis
San Clemente Green
23 Chapital
23 Chapital
San Clemente, CA 92672-9311

Coyle, James

From: Jeanne Green [innerlight52@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:19 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Jeanne Green
Code Pink Taos
17 SR 230
17 SR 230
El Prado, NM 87529

Coyle, James

From: william k noble jr [wnoblejr@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:13 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

william noble jr
voter
6103 w charter oak rd
6103 w charter oak rd glendale, az
Glendale, AZ 85304

Coyle, James

From: john Van Eyck [john@hahana.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:12 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. John Van Eyck
SEIU (retired)
1517 Stuart St.
Berkeley, CA 94703

Coyle, James

From: J. Allen Feryok [aferyok@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:12 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. I am very unhappy with this.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. NOW.

J. Allen Feryok
1520 Jones St
Monessen, PA 15062

Coyle, James

From: Jared Laiti [jared.laiti@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:10 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jared Laiti
502 Redwood Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95815

Coyle, James

From: Mark Donaldson [azathoth-x@cfl.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:07 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mark Donaldson
1548 Croftwood Drive
Melbourne, FL 32935

Coyle, James

From: Richard Rosenthal [rrla@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:05 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Richard Rosenthal
1328 S Sierra Bonita Av
LA, CA 90019-2503

Coyle, James

From: Thomas Ambrogi [tambrogi@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:05 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Rev. Thomas Ambrogi
Progressive Christians Uniting
737 Alden Road
737 Alden Road
Claremont, CA, CA 91711-4221

Coyle, James

From: Dean Webb [dm_webb@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:02 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dean Webb
4522 36th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98199

Coyle, James

From: Sandra Couch [sndrcch@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 12:01 AM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Sandra Couch
2903 Bartlett Court
Unit 201
Naperville, IL 60564

Coyle, James

From: Rich Goldberg [rgclimber@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Rich Goldberg
118 Highland Ave.
Penngrove, CA 94951

Coyle, James

From: Deborah Pendrey [deborah.rssc@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Deborah Pendrey
Ojai Valley Green Coalition
309 Riverside Rd.
Oak View, CA 93022

Coyle, James

From: Kenny Vaher [Muggrat@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Kenny Vaher
219 West 24th Street
219 West 24th Street
NYC, NY 10011

Coyle, James

From: Carole Mock [caroledeonne@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Carole Mock
107 W. Simpson St. #13
Lafayette, CO 80026

Coyle, James

From: Beth Niederman [bethyandgarrett@xmission.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Beth Niederman
974 E 700 South
974 E 700 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

Coyle, James

From: Art Hanson [ahanson47@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Art Hanson
1815 Briarwood Dr.
Lansing, MI 48917-1773

Coyle, James

From: ordell vee [otvee@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr. ordell vee
usps
427 2nd st. n.e.
madelia, MN 56062

Coyle, James

From: Wilma A Wheeler [wilma.bryce@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Wilma A Wheeler
P.O. Box 3208
PO Box 3208
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

Coyle, James

From: Gail Linnerson [GLinnerkin@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Gail Linnerson
719 9th Ave SE
719 9th Ave SE
Minneapolis, MN 55414

Coyle, James

From: Linda Espino [laespino@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Linda Espino
2506 Horton Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101

Coyle, James

From: Elisse De Sio [elissedesio@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Elisse De Sio
Self
P.O. Box 620108
Woodside, CA 94062

Coyle, James

From: mary izett [mwizett@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

n/a mary izett
n/a
12 Cerro Encantado
n/a
Lafayette, CA 94549-4908

Coyle, James

From: Mike Smith [mike55smith@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mike Smith
1531 1st Ave
Seattle, WA 98101

Coyle, James

From: Randall Webb [lawrkw@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Randall Webb
2328 NW Glisan St. #10
na
Portland, OR 97210

Coyle, James

From: Kermit Cuff [tierno23@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kermit Cuff
338 Mariposa Ave. #2
338 Mariposa Ave. #2
Mountain View, CA 94041-1160

Coyle, James

From: Mark Hulett [runner@ywave.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Mark Hulett
14720 McIntosh Ln SE
14720 McIntosh Ln SE
Tenino, WA 98589

Coyle, James

From: Margaret Aguilar [almanest@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Margaret Aguilar
1846 W. Belle Plaine Ave.
1846 W. Belle Plaine Ave.
Chicago, IL 60613-1827

Coyle, James

From: jackie mason [mason.jacquie@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:38 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is NOT acceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to PROTECT the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must STOP. NOW! SO SAY: WE, tHE PEOPLE...

jackie mason
1970 osceola pkwy
1970 pscepla pkwy
kissimmee, FL 34743

Coyle, James

From: Rita Sokolow [raesok@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:38 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Rita Sokolow
Union of American Physicians & Dentists
3500 S. Barrington Ave.
3500 S. Barrington Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Coyle, James

From: Jerry Bowman [bowmanjerry18@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jerry Bowman
1924 Wellington RD
harrison, AR 72601

Coyle, James

From: Daniel Belachew [DBelachew@lycos.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Public Health & Safety Come First
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Daniel Belachew
300 Prospect Street #3
Cambridge, MA 02139

Coyle, James

From: Wendy Oser [woser@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:36 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Wendy Oser
Nuclear Guardianship Project
1439 Santa Fe Ave.
Berkeley, CA 94702

Coyle, James

From: S Hi [jazzfresh@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

S Hi
255 South Normandie Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90004-6513

Coyle, James

From: Cletus Stein [cletus@arn.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:30 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr Cletus Stein
The Peace Farm
5113 SW 16th
5113 sw16th
amarillo, TX 79106

Coyle, James

From: Williamn Perkins [perki@ucla.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:27 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Williamn Perkins
1347 Avenida De Cortez
Pacific Palisades, CA 90272

Coyle, James

From: Michael Tomczyszyn [mtomczyszyn@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:27 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Michael Tomczyszyn
243 Ramsell St
San Francisco, CA 94132

Coyle, James

From: Nina Tatlock [tatlock@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:26 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Nina Tatlock
1413 Beach Club Lane
1413 Beach Club Ln
Apollo Beach, FL 33572

Coyle, James

From: carlos oropeza [carlos_oropeza1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:26 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

carlos oropeza
106 Ava Ave
somerdale, NJ 08083

Coyle, James

From: Jill zamEk [jzk@charter.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jill zamEk
1123 Flora Rd.
1123 Flora Rd.
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420

Coyle, James

From: Gordon Thompson [gordon_l_thompson@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:22 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Gordon Thompson
9849 Towner Rd
Portland, MI 48875-9409

Coyle, James

From: andy lupenko [fccsd@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:21 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

andy lupenko
8555 golden avenue
lemon grove, CA 91945-2615

Coyle, James

From: susanna liberty [susannas@efn.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms susanna liberty
po box 324
pobox 324 eugene or 97405
eugene, OR 97405

Coyle, James

From: MARY E MCGILLIGAN [mmcgilligan@frontiernet.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms MARY E MCGILLIGAN
814 5TH AVE
TWO HARBORS, MN 55616

Coyle, James

From: erica lann-clark [lanntell@cruzio.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. erica lann-clark
Sierra Club
132 alturas way
132 alturas way
soquel, CA 95073

Coyle, James

From: carol paulsen [paulsenart@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:17 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

citizen carol paulsen
concerned citizen
1135 2nd street
baywood park, CA 93402

Coyle, James

From: John Greenberg [jsg1@copper.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. John Greenberg
Bookshop owner
564 Butterfield Rd.
564 Butterfield Road
Brattleboro, VT 05301

Coyle, James

From: Cheryl Liniman [CherMoeLin@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Cheryl Liniman
6350 S. Canterbury Rd.
Parma, OH 44129

Coyle, James

From: John Viacrucis [catchaway@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. John Viacrucis
3002 17th St. S Apt.206
Moorhead, MN 56560

Coyle, James

From: Chris Nelson [chris4pax@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Chris Nelson
Veggie Voyagers
2300 B Estes Rd.
2300 B Estes Rd. Chico, Ca.
Chico, CA 95928

Coyle, James

From: Robert O'Brien [robrien2000@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Robert O'Brien
972 Allamanda DR.
Delray Beach, FL 33483

Coyle, James

From: Eric Meyer [Stickwork@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:08 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Eric Meyer
POBox 2021
PoBox2021 Wimberley
Wimberley, TX 78676

Coyle, James

From: Eric Meyer [Stickwork@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:08 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Eric Meyer
POBox 2021
PoBox2021 Wimberley
Wimberley, TX 78676

Coyle, James

From: frank belcastro [fpbelcast@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr frank belcastro
n/a
285 north grandview avenue
none
dubuque, IA 52001-6327

Coyle, James

From: Alexander Brown [ps_865472962@care2.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Alexander Brown
608 Lowell St.
Manchester, NH 03104

Coyle, James

From: Linda Harter [lindaharter@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms Linda Harter
9004 Shepard Dr
872 Border Ave c-1
Austin, TX 78753

Coyle, James

From: Jeffrey Turner [jturner@alum.rpi.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 11:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Jeffrey Turner
125 Lincoln Street
Pittsfield, MA 01201

Coyle, James

From: Edward Petroski [ep31148@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Ed Petroski Edward Petroski
Private U.S.A. Citizen
2031 Pittston Avenue
2031 Pittston Avenue. Scranton, Pa. 18505-4493 Scranton, PA 18505-4493

Coyle, James

From: Yayoi Koizumi [springchild74@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Yayoi Koizumi
150 West Village Pl. Apt.315
150 West Village Place Apt. 315 IThaca NY 14850 Ithaca, NY 14850

Coyle, James

From: Michael Swanson [swanson71258@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Michael Swanson
1121 W. Clay St.
Lancaster, PA 17603

Coyle, James

From: Bill Denneen [BDenneen@KCBX.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Bill Denneen
Citizens for Vehicle Free Nipomo Dunes
1040 Cielo Lane
Nipomo, CA 93444-9039

Coyle, James

From: Stella Godbey [stellandon@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Stella Godbey
314 Woodview Drive
314 Woodview Dr.
Brandenburg, KY 40108

Coyle, James

From: Michael Ott [snorklmike@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:52 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Michael Ott
450 Key Deer Blvd.
Big Pine Key, FL 33043

Coyle, James

From: Rebecca Field [rebecca@fieldonline.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:50 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Rebecca Field
none
105 Vista del Campo
Los Gatos, CA 95030-6312

Coyle, James

From: anna berg [annaberg45@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:49 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms anna berg
133 W 24th st
6
New York, NY 10011

Coyle, James

From: Ken Greenwald [ken.filmman@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Ken Greenwald
1930 Stewart St. G2
Santa Monica, CA 90404-4942

Coyle, James

From: Bob Bousquet [bousquetrb@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Bob Bousquet
PO Box 101
Bryantville, MA 02327

Coyle, James

From: Serit Kotowski [serit@cybermesa.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Serit Kotowski
Embudo Valley Environmental Monitoring Group PO Box291 Dixon, NM 87527

Coyle, James

From: Jerry Morrissey [jlmorrisey@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jerry Morrissey
19631 Encino Way
19631 Encino Way
San Antonio, TX 78259

Coyle, James

From: Athanasia Gregoriades [gregori341@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Athanasia Gregoriades
I am a member of unicef, una, unifem
341 W. 24 St.
341 W. 24 St., NYC
New York, NY 10011

Coyle, James

From: Marilyn Petkov [marilynsdogfarm@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Marilyn Petkov
471 Midline Rd
Freeville, NY 13068

Coyle, James

From: Pamala Thomas [parvatiprem@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Rev. Pamala Thomas
n/a
2622 Montana Avenue
Apt. A
Santa Monica, CA 90403

Coyle, James

From: Don Schwartz [tempdhs@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Don Schwartz
26 Skylark Drive #12-A
Larkspur, CA 94939

Coyle, James

From: Doug Bender [alfabender@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Doug Bender
261 Vista del Parque
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Coyle, James

From: Todd Snyder [todd.clark.snyder@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Todd Snyder
2447 Post street
2447 Post street
San Francisco, CA 94115

Coyle, James

From: Lee Beaty [leebeaty@visi.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lee Beaty
2801 42nd Ave. So.
Minneapolis, MN 55406

Coyle, James

From: Lewis Ward [lew_ward@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Lewis Ward
246 Smith Rd
Newfield, NY 14867

Coyle, James

From: Rachel Garibay-Wynnberry [rachelgaribay@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:36 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs Rachel Garibay-Wynnberry
None
3342 Yonge Ave.
3342 Yonge Ave.
Sarasota, FL 34235

Coyle, James

From: Ronald Burris [flinthills@ckt.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ronald Burris
606 Cherry St.
606 Cherry
Colony, KS 66015

Coyle, James

From: Roma Halatyn [romaromaroma@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Roma Halatyn
64 Chestnut Street
Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522

Coyle, James

From: Angelica Saucedo [AMSAUCEDA@UCDAVIS.EDU]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:33 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Angelica Saucedo
3322 Nevada Ave
El Monte, CA 91731

Coyle, James

From: Susan Friedwald [Babey10@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:33 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Susan Friedwald
145 East 27th Street
145 East 27th Street
New York, NY 10016

Coyle, James

From: kellie Huynh [kelliehuynh@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:27 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

kellie Huynh
1465 Municipal Ave
Plano, TX 75074

Coyle, James

From: Robert Drescher [dreschernew@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:27 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Robert Drescher
PO Box 3401
PO Box 3401
NYC, NY 10008

Coyle, James

From: Robert Drescher [dreschernew@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:25 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Robert Drescher
PO Box 3401
PO Box 3401
NYC, NY 10008

Coyle, James

From: Joan burds [textoravis@hughes.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Joan burds
19979 cave rd.
NA
ste. genevieve, MO 64670-9063

Coyle, James

From: Celine Grenier [celine@skyhighway.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

The NRC is apparently attempting to redefine the principles of nuclear regulation from citizen protection to enabling. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Celine Grenier
1819 43rd Ave.
1819 43rd Ave
Capitola, CA 95010

Coyle, James

From: Mike Carberry [mikecarberry@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Mike Carberry
Green State Solutions
2029 Friendship St.
Iowa City, IA 52245-4553

Coyle, James

From: Constance Fredenberg [conniefredenberg@mtaonline.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:23 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Constance Fredenberg
12322 Biscane Dr.
Palmer, AK 99645

Coyle, James

From: Darren Ginn [darrenginn@att.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:23 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Darren Ginn
136 Peachtree Memorial Dr.
PA1
Atlanta, GA 30309

Coyle, James

From: Ben Thomas [bithomas2@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:22 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop now.

Ben Thomas
n/a
4204 Antilla Pl
Greensboro, NC 27407-3111

Coyle, James

From: Vera Cousins [vcousins1@iowatelecom.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:21 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Vera Cousins
903 16th Ave.
903 16th Ave.
Grinnell, IA 50112

Coyle, James

From: Joyce Frohn [AHengst1@new.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:20 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Joyce Frohn
425 Congress Ave
Oshkosh, WI 54901

Coyle, James

From: Theresa del Rosario [tdr63@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Theresa del Rosario
881 Otto Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55102

Coyle, James

From: David Sanders [actiondave72@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. David Sanders
2022 Driftstone Drive
Glendora, CA 91740-5388

Coyle, James

From: Marc Beschler [hfarmer@juno.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Marc Beschler
5 East 51st Street, #4A
New York, NY 10022

Coyle, James

From: Brad Jones [bradly_jones@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Brad Jones
2035 Blackmud Creek Drivw
2035 Blackmud Creek Drive
Salt Lake City, UT 84150

Coyle, James

From: Brian Gibbons [btpg2252@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Brian Gibbons
9133 edmonston Terrace
Apt 304
Greenbelt, MD 20770

Coyle, James

From: David Schreiber [dschr@ureach.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr David Schreiber
JALSA
301 Summer St
301 Summer St, Arlington, MA
Arlington, MA 02474

Coyle, James

From: Emma Squires [emma.625@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Emma Squires
Citizen
1412 Keeler Drive
Irving, TX 75060

Coyle, James

From: shannon wenger [shannon.zahnl@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

shannon wenger
506 w 16th
506 west 16th
Bloomington, IN 47404

Coyle, James

From: Elaine Becker [elainebecker@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Elaine Becker
2514 Sharmar Rd.
Roanoke, VA 24018-2625

Coyle, James

From: Tali Weiss [Tshake2231@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Tali Weiss
225 central park west
New york, NY 10024

Coyle, James

From: Patricia Walters [pwalters7391@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Patricia Walters
6199 E. Broadway #122
6199 E.. Broadway #122
Tucson, AZ 85711-4011

Coyle, James

From: Ruth Miller [ruthmiller@mac.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ruth Miller
1819 Billabong Lane
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Coyle, James

From: William Wilgus [wmwilgus@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:06 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels. This is unacceptable: the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation? For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

William Wilgus
530 NE 134th Court
Silver Springs, FL 34488-3936

Coyle, James

From: Susan Kulis [susankulis@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:06 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Susan Kulis
self
87 Briarcliff Rd.
Hamden, CT 06518

Coyle, James

From: David Strong [elyziadavid@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

David Strong
61 Barton Hts
Greenfield, MA 01301

Coyle, James

From: Pamela VourosCallahan [pamelazoe@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Pamela VourosCallahan
11761 Adams Road
11761 Adams Road
Granger, IN 46530-8618

Coyle, James

From: Lincoln Justice [ljustice@centurytel.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Lincoln Justice
Midwest Energy Alternatives
312 West Summit Ave
312 W. Summit Ave
Seymour, MO 65746

Coyle, James

From: Steve Breyman [breym@rpi.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 10:00 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Prof. Steve Breyman
25 Cross St.
Hudson, NY 12534

Coyle, James

From: Mercedes Armillas [miarmillas@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms Mercedes Armillas
672 Tenth Street
672 10th Street
Brooklyn, NY 11215

Coyle, James

From: DAN CAPPELLO [LOUIS21329@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

DAN CAPPELLO
2015 BANDEK
LAWRENCE, PA 15055

Coyle, James

From: pauline wagner [ctwagner@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MRS/RN pauline wagner
concerned citizen/RN
102 alder st.
102 alder st.
mechanicsburg, PA 17055

Coyle, James

From: Thomas Matsuda [matsudat@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Thomas Matsuda
655 Roaring Brook Rd
655 Roaring Brook Rd
Conway, MA 01341

Coyle, James

From: Brit Harvey [dia@britharvey.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Brit Harvey
1224 Oregon St
1224 Oregon St, Berkeley CA 94702
Berkeley, CA 94702

Coyle, James

From: maura Derey [moezy08@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:49 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

al and maura der maura Derey
4061 SKINNER LAKE ROAD
4061 SKINNER LAKE ROAD
LAPEER, MI 48446

Coyle, James

From: Alice Bowron [lupinsgalore@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Alice Bowron
3031 Ewing Av S
Apartment 337
Minneapolis, MN 55416-4290

Coyle, James

From: Erica Gray [veggielady@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Erica Gray
self, nother and grandmother
406 Glendale Dr.
406 Glendale Dr.
Henrico, VA 23229

Coyle, James

From: Lillian Wilder [silverworksbylillian@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety through regulation.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. Have the lessons of Fukushima been forgotten so quickly? In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now. This is in your hands!

Ms. Lillian Wilder
Member of the public.
7521 Margaret Circle
Anchorage, AK 99518

Coyle, James

From: Mary Ann Hilgeman [mahilgeman@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Sister Mary Ann Hilgeman
6400 Minnesota Ave
St Louis, MO 63111-2807

Coyle, James

From: Davin Peterson [davinsemail@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Davin Peterson
2846 Lowell Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Coyle, James

From: Janet Draper [jntdraper@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Janet Draper
1825 Dunedin Ave.
Duluth, MN 55803

Coyle, James

From: rick bissonnette [rcebissy@roadrunner.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MR. rick bissonnette
849 lindley ave
849 lindley ave.
cuyahoga falls, OH 44223-2914

Coyle, James

From: Debra Willis [dlwshield-action2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Debra Willis
5772 Bellflower Drive
Newark, CA 94560

Coyle, James

From: Marilyn Biernot [gypsymarilyn@live.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Marilyn Biernot
2850 Goodells Rd.
2850 Goodells Rd.
Goodells, MI 48027

Coyle, James

From: Ron Rattner [ronrattner@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Ron Rattner
Retired attorney
1998 Broadway #1204
San Francisco, CA 94109-2206

Coyle, James

From: Robert Resnik [raresnik@starpower.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr Robert Resnik
individual
5508 Hoover Street
5508 Hoover Street
Bethesda, MD 20817-3716

Coyle, James

From: Daniel Samek [wildseederus@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Daniel Samek
9404 San Rafael Av., N.E.
none
Albuquerque, NM 87109

Coyle, James

From: Susan Bird [birdsusanmn@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:38 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Susan Bird
personal
24 Maplewood Rd.
24 Maplewood Rd.
Asheville, NC 28804

Coyle, James

From: Suzanne valencia [suzmvalencia@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms Suzanne valencia
none
410 Lemon Grove Ave
410 Lemon Grove Ave
West Melbourne, FL 32904-2408

Coyle, James

From: Stephen Mudrick [jandsmudrick@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:31 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Stephen Mudrick
1015 Prospect St.
1015 Prospect St.
Columbia, MO 65203

Coyle, James

From: Melissa Bishop [mmorga10@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:30 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Melissa Bishop
24 Church St.
Deposit, NY 13754

Coyle, James

From: Shakima Jones [shakimajones@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:25 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Shakima Jones
42 Hull Street
42 Hull Street Brooklyn NY 11233
Brooklyn, NY 11233

Coyle, James

From: Patrick McGinnis [Padderic1@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr Patrick McGinnis
6416 5th PL
6416 5th PL
Vero Beach, FL 32968

Coyle, James

From: Doug & Carol Wingeier [dcwing@att.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Doug & Carol Wingeier
First Congregtional United Churchd of Christ, Asheville, NC
266 Merrimon Ave.
Asheville, NC 28801-1218

Coyle, James

From: David Brodnax [brodnax@alumni.northwestern.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

David Brodnax
323 Wisconsin Avenue
Oak Park, IL 60302

Coyle, James

From: dawn odonnell [dmarie@nycap.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:22 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

dawn odonnell
54 bump hill rd
greenfield center, NY 12833

Coyle, James

From: Bernadette Brophy [bernbro@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:16 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Bernadette Brophy
220 S. Lombard Ave.
Lombard, IL 60148

Coyle, James

From: Tom Erickson [tomatbob@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:15 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

citizen Tom Erickson
109 Taormina Jn
Ojai, CA 93023

Coyle, James

From: Anthony Albert [albert2910@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Anthony Albert
664 NW 18th Street
Corvallis, OR 97330-5779

Coyle, James

From: John and Martha Stoltenberg [jpstolten@frontier.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

John and Martha Stoltenberg
N8362 State Highway 67
P.O. Box 596
Elkhart Lake, WI 53020-0596

Coyle, James

From: DANIEL SCHLAGMAN [DESCO0316@AOL.COM]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

DANIEL SCHLAGMAN
338 CHERRY PLACE
338 CHERRY PLACE
EAST MEADOW, NY 11554

Coyle, James

From: Beth Schwartz [beth4@wallflowergallery.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Beth Schwartz
6430 S.W. 62 Court
S. Miami, FL 33143

Coyle, James

From: Douglas Love [dlove@douglove.info]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Douglas Love
Prince George's Peace and Justice Coalition
3 D Plateau Place
Greenbelt, MD 20770

Coyle, James

From: Joe Newman [wind_ginny@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Joe Newman
Joe Newman
Box 833
Box 833 Bozeman
Bozeman, MT 59771

Coyle, James

From: eli hegeman [ehegeman@pipeline.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

dr. eli hegeman
100 riverside
10c
ny, NY 10024-4822

Coyle, James

From: Troy Leutz [t_leutz@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:08 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Troy Leutz
810 N. East Ave.
Jackson, MI 49202

Coyle, James

From: dr michael stocker [mastocke@syr.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

dr. dr michael stocker
100 Riverside Dr. 10C
10c
new york, NY 10024-4822

Coyle, James

From: Tomiko Ibser [tomiko.ibser@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Tomiko Ibser
2670 Kadema Dr.
Sacramento, CA 95864-6914

Coyle, James

From: Edith Coleman [ecol0106@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Edith Coleman
2600 Frederick Avenue
Wilmington, DE 19805

Coyle, James

From: peter Oppenheimer [findpetero@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. peter Oppenheimer
50 Montezuma
50 Montezuma
Forrest Knolls, CA 94933

Coyle, James

From: peter Oppenheimer [findpetero@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. peter Oppenheimer
50 Montezuma
50 Montezuma
Forrest Knolls, CA 94933

Coyle, James

From: Robert Pancner [rpancn@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Robert Pancner
USW Associate
7936 Redondo Ct.
none
DARIEN, IA 60561

Coyle, James

From: Donna Hart [dhart@ihmsisters.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms Donna Hart
Sisters IHM, Monroe, Mi
610 W. Elm
610 W. Elm Monroe, Mi 48162
Monroe, MI 48162

Coyle, James

From: Alan Wojtalik [alan_wojtalik@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:06 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Alan Wojtalik
3723 Green Oak Court
Baltimore, MD 21234

Coyle, James

From: Jennifer M Weishaar [jennifermweishaar@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:06 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Jennifer M Weishaar
255 N Michigan St #58
Lawrence, KS 66044

Coyle, James

From: Carol Parham [pb2au.peace@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Carol Parham
50 Norwich Road
50 Norwich Road
East Haddam, CT 06423

Coyle, James

From: Maria Jackson [slocorral@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Maria Jackson
1709 Corralitos Ave.
1709 Corralitos Ave
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-3012

Coyle, James

From: David Finkelstein [davesamf@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

M.D. David Finkelstein
202 Trailwood Lane
Lafayette, LA 70508

Coyle, James

From: Ulrich Herrmann [ulmar@att.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 9:00 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mrs Ulrich Herrmann
true cost of nukes
913 Shady Oaks Ct
913 shady oaka ct
Arlington, TX 76012

Coyle, James

From: Linda Murray [springard@epix.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs Linda Murray
49 Prospect St
Mansfield, PA 16933

Coyle, James

From: Edward Hanson [edw.hanson@netzero.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Edward Hanson
7630 Leyden Lane
7630 Leyden Lane
Commerce City, CO 80022-1320

Coyle, James

From: judith carluccio [dcarluccio@optonline.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

judith carluccio
nuclear power watch
100 beach dr.
100 beach dr.
seaside park, NJ 08752

Coyle, James

From: Bill Carter [bbillccarter@netscape.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Nuclear Power Bill Carter
2103 Parker Lane
Austin, TX 78741

Coyle, James

From: Kathleen Van Dam [kmvd@roadrunner.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Kathleen Van Dam
13757 Tajamar Court
Corpus Christi, TX 78418

Coyle, James

From: Irucka Embry [iembry@peacemail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Irucka Embry
EcoC2S
919 Kay Street
Murfreesboro, TN 37130

Coyle, James

From: Shirley Johnston [shirleyjohnston2010@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Shirley Johnston
none
1917 Las Montanas Court
1917 Las Montanas Court
Brentwood, CA 94513

Coyle, James

From: Peter Schwalbenberg [pschwalbenberg@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:50 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Peter Schwalbenberg
1236 16th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94122

Coyle, James

From: M C Kubiak [m.c.kubiak@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:49 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

M C Kubiak
43 White pl
n/a
BMI, IL 61701-1859

Coyle, James

From: Henry Schwan [owlswan@ironpeak.toad.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Henry Schwan
P.O. Box 2513
Aptos, CA 95001

Coyle, James

From: noahdm sanchez [noahdmsanchez@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. noahdm sanchez
sierra club
1414 east 108th ave apt#A
1414 E 108th Ave apt#A
Tampa, FL 33612-5494

Coyle, James

From: Jane Starratt [Jstarratt@lycos.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jane Starratt Jane Starratt
2450 Emigrant Trail
Markleeville, CA 96120

Coyle, James

From: Clay Turnbull [turnbull@together.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Clay Turnbull
1799 Simpson Brook Road
1799 Simpson Brook Road
Townshend, VT 05353

Coyle, James

From: Judith Smith [axisdance@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Judith Smith
2712 Grande Vista Ave
Oakland, CA 94601

Coyle, James

From: Jason Waldo [jandventerprises@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jason Waldo
590 Anderson Rd
Sweetwater, TN 37874-6608

Coyle, James

From: Ann Breeden [annbreeden@roadrunner.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Ann Breeden Ann Breeden
19 Willowbrook Lane
Sullivan, ME 04664

Coyle, James

From: Terry Johnson [tlj-loki@q.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Terry Johnson
1784 Peltier Lake Dr.
Centerville, MN 55038

Coyle, James

From: cindy curran [cindcurran@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

cindy curran
481 ridge road
481 ridge road
bowdoinham, ME 04008

Coyle, James

From: George Bissell [n_bissell@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. George Bissell
citizen
5 Sunset Dr
5 Sunset Dr, Dalton, MA 01226
Dalton, MA 01226

Coyle, James

From: Elaine Holder [elaineholder@att.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Elaine Holder
San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace
274 Cuesta
274 Cuesta, San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405-1134

Coyle, James

From: Patricia L. Lent [patlent@juno.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Patricia L. Lent
818 Marywood
Royal Oak, MI 48067-1728

Coyle, James

From: Debra Rehn [BibleoGirl@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:38 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Debra Rehn
5130 SE 30th Av. #9
#9
Portland, RI 07202

Coyle, James

From: susan zalon [sygreens@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

susan zalon
3424 marina dr.
Santa Barbara, CA 93110-2426

Coyle, James

From: Lyn Strangstad [strangstad@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lyn Strangstad
327 Doty St.
327 Doty St.
Mineral Point, WI 53565

Coyle, James

From: Evan Ravitz [evan@vote.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:36 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Evan Ravitz
Vote.org
evan@vote.org
Boulder, CO 80302

Coyle, James

From: Kit Lofroos [kltkwmn@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:36 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kit Lofroos
101A Post
Petaluma, CA 94952

Coyle, James

From: Stephanie Fairchild [sdfair71@frontier.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:36 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Stephanie Fairchild
6885 Sherrard Rd.
6885 Sherrard Rd.
Cambridge, OH 43725

Coyle, James

From: Ken Bossong [kbossong@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Ken Bossong
SUN DAY Campaign
8606 Greenwood Avenue
Apt. 2
Takoma Park, MD 20912

Coyle, James

From: Richard Hybil [rjhandjlh@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:33 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Richard Hybil
999 Utsonati Lane
Brevard, NC 28712

Coyle, James

From: Lindsay Suter [suter16@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:33 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Lindsay Suter
Lindsay Suter, Architects
16 Mill Rd
16 mill rd
North Branford, CT 06471

Coyle, James

From: Susan Anderson [susanjam@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:32 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Susan Anderson
540 Bayside Rd.
Arcata, CA 95521

Coyle, James

From: Susan Anderson [susanjam@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:32 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Susan Anderson
540 Bayside Rd.
Arcata, CA 95521

Coyle, James

From: Vincent Ruiz Bouvet [vncntr54@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:32 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Vincent Ruiz Bouvet
self
6825 Dove Street
893 Empire Ave., # 204
Ventura, CA 93003-7115

Coyle, James

From: Jeremy Nathan Marks [nf_tagore@yahoo.ca]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:31 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Jeremy Nathan Marks
I represent myself
13911 Flint Rock Road
Rockville, MD 20853-2650

Coyle, James

From: Mark Holmgren [markholmgren_1@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:30 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Mark Holmgren
retired
2039 17th St. S.
none
St. Petersburg, FL 33712

Coyle, James

From: Kelley Scanlon [rynn30@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:29 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kelley Scanlon
281 Norwood Avenue
Syracuse, NY 13206

Coyle, James

From: Bruce Jenkins [bjenksp@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:28 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Bruce Jenkins
907 Tanager Ct
907 Tanager Ct
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

Coyle, James

From: Bobbie Flowers [bobbie_flowers@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:28 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Bobbie Flowers
418 West 17th Street, Apt. 22A
Apt. 22A
New York, NY 10011-5826

Coyle, James

From: Vic and Barby Ulmer [odw@magiclink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:26 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable. There is no level of safety for nuclear material either for power or weapons.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels. We don't want radioactive materials to be used at all!

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr and Mrs Vic and Barby Ulmer
our developing world
13004 Paseo Presada
13004 Paseo Presada
Saratoga, CA 95070-4125

Coyle, James

From: Paul Auerbach [auerbachp@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:25 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Vice President Paul Auerbach
The Interfaith Alliance - Long Island Chapter
63-37 Douglaston Parkway
63-37 Douglaston Parkway, Douglaston, NY 11362 Douglaston, NY 11362

Coyle, James

From: Carol Fowler [fowler83@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Carol Fowler
243 Poplar Av.
243 Poplar Av.
Hayward, CA 94541-3806

Coyle, James

From: Joan Taylor [palmcanyon@mac.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:23 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Joan Taylor
1850 Smoke Tree Lane
Palm Springs, CA 92264

Coyle, James

From: Linda Richardson [lr.handot@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:22 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Linda Richardson
none
2189 Sallee Drive
0
Lexington, KY 40513

Coyle, James

From: Joseph Bohan [josephbohan3@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:21 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Joseph Bohan
15 Maywood Ave
Rye Brook, NY 10573

Coyle, James

From: Lisa Gosnell [eotas@mchsi.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:20 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Lisa Gosnell
NIRS
24536 Marsh Hawk Lane
24536 Marsh Hawk Lane
Georgetown, DE 19947

Coyle, James

From: Joel Hildebrandt [joel@earthsong.org.nz]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:20 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Joel Hildebrandt
3044a Halcyon Ct.
Berkeley, CA 94705

Coyle, James

From: ray trozzo [rtrozzo102@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:15 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ray trozzo
3853 kittyhawk dr
3853 kittyhawk dr
fort myers, FL 33905

Coyle, James

From: Jo Anna Hebbberger [jhebbberger@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jo Anna Hebbberger
701 56th Street
Des Moines, IA 50312-1801

Coyle, James

From: Dan Smith [command_z_design@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Dan Smith
1123 25th Ave
Seattle, WA 98122
Seattle, WA 98122

Coyle, James

From: Paul Szymanowski [pszymanowski@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr. Paul Szymanowski
USW
P.O. Box 74
P.O. Box 74
Curtice, OH 43412

Coyle, James

From: cecile lenemane [cecilep@att.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

cecile lenemane
National WRiters' Union
2550 dana street 5-B
2550 dana st berkeley
berkeley, CA 94704

Coyle, James

From: James Marvin [jjmarvinfl@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

James Marvin
415 17th Ave. N.
St. Petersburg, FL 33704

Coyle, James

From: William Fisk [fiskw@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

William Fisk
125 Chimney Glen Dr
125 Chimney Glen Dr
Hendersonville, NC 28739

Coyle, James

From: Natalie Batovsky [nat121874@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Natalie Batovsky
118 S. Main St.
P.O. Box 464
Union Bridge, MD 21791-9140

Coyle, James

From: John Douglas [johndog@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

John Douglas
PO Box 8552
Goleta, CA 93118

Coyle, James

From: Lynne Teplin [lynnet@lagcc.cuny.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:08 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Lynne Teplin
830 Palmer Road #3B
Bronxville, NY 10708-3316

Coyle, James

From: Patricia Lenderman [plenderman@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Patricia Lenderman
Nuclear Information and Resource Service
15133 McCann
15133 McCann
Southgate, MI 48195

Coyle, James

From: Phyliss Sladek [sladek7@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:06 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

Thank you for all the work you do.

I am very concerned to learn that the NRC appears to actively attempt to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Phyliss Sladek
PO Box 13888
1185 Anderson lane
Santa Barbara, CA 93107

Coyle, James

From: Boyer c. August [BeauAugust@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:05 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Boyer c. August
1957 East Ave
1957 east ave
Hayward, CA 94541-5404

Coyle, James

From: Tina Snyder [tonopahtina@frontiernet.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Tina Snyder
3260 Golden Mtn Ln
Tonopah, NV 89049

Coyle, James

From: Wm. A., Sr. & Angeline Morocco [abmorocco@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Wm. A., Sr. & Angeline Morocco
1917 Paul Street
Farrell, PA 16121-1323

Coyle, James

From: Kevin Smith [tubalove@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kevin Smith
56 K St, Apt 1
Turners Falls, MA 01376

Coyle, James

From: Dave Parrish [throwing.hamsters@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 8:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

If you have children, grand-children, family that you hold dear to you, please read on.

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dave Parrish
Operation SAVE the Earth
7107 N 45th Ave
Glendale, AZ 85301

Coyle, James

From: Arbie Hansen [hanfor@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Arbie Hansen
mother and grandmother
1316 Princeton Dr. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87106

Coyle, James

From: James Smith [scosmith@cruzio.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms James Smith
PianoSmith
411 Stanford Street
Watsonville, CA 95076

Coyle, James

From: n schmitt [ns1224@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

n schmitt
1274 lexington
chicago, IL 60607

Coyle, James

From: n schmitt [ns1224@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

n schmitt
1274 lexington
chicago, IL 60607

Coyle, James

From: Karen Starr [ravenbadger@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Karen Starr
N/A
1392 VT RT 232
1392 VT RTE 232
Marshfield, VT 05658

Coyle, James

From: Jerilyn Bodemar [jbodemar@baymoon.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Jerilyn Bodemar
wilpf int'l
411 Stanford Street
Watsonville, CA 95076

Coyle, James

From: Judy Landress [jlandr2000@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Judy Landress
Nuclear Info. & Resource Service
242 Montclair
242 Montclair
Corpus Christi, TX 78412

Coyle, James

From: greg goodwin [ashiknow@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

greg goodwin
13804 26th Ave. NE
Seattle, WA 98125

Coyle, James

From: Lorraine Kirk [howclear@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:52 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lorraine Kirk
1934 Lazy Z Rd
Nederland, CO 80466

Coyle, James

From: dan kelly [digdummy@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:52 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

owner dan kelly
KEI
3725 36th loop
3725 36th loop
olympia, WA 98502

Coyle, James

From: Jeanne Deller [jkdeller@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:52 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms Jeanne Deller
4235 164 Ave Se
4235 164 Ave SE,
Issaquah, WA 98027

Coyle, James

From: Lisa Gherardi [gherardi2@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:50 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lisa Gherardi
435 Alberto Way #16
435 Alberto Way, #16
Los Gatos, CA 95032-5425

Coyle, James

From: Christine Hansen [chris@christinehansen.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:50 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Christine Hansen
6003 Jon Court SE
Olympia, WA 98513

Coyle, James

From: Nadine Luru [luru0201@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:50 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Nadine Luru
1243 N Kraemer
Placentia, CA 92870

Coyle, James

From: Walter Kloefkorn [wkloefkorn@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:49 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Walter Kloefkorn
PO Box 181
Loon Lake, WA 99148

Coyle, James

From: alice farber [alicebethrhodes@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

alice farber
32 alpine way
huntington sta.
ny, NY 11746

Coyle, James

From: Karen Giles [fernwoods@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Karen Giles
127 Fernwood Dr
127 Fernwood Dr
Portage, PA 15946-8923

Coyle, James

From: Martha Perez [marthaoperez@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

General Politea Martha Perez
GPA
920 NW Kearney ST APT#110
110
Portland, OR 97209

Coyle, James

From: Herbie Robinson [hrob@curbside-recording.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Herbie Robinson
116 Carver Rd.
Newton, MA 02461

Coyle, James

From: Candi Ausman [crausman@wildmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Candi Ausman
Self
4555 Thornton Ave Apt 62
Fremont, CA 94536

Coyle, James

From: susan peirce [speirce@prodigy.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

susan peirce
143 Eagle Feather Way
Lyons, CO 80540

Coyle, James

From: marcia bailey [marciabcelo@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MS. marcia bailey
1270 Cabbage Patch Rd
Burnsville, NC 28714-7321

Coyle, James

From: Sarah Gallagher [SWGall@nyc.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Sarah Gallagher
1136 First Avenue
Apt 7
New York, NY 10065

Coyle, James

From: Stephen Weitz [weitzs@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Stephen Weitz
2757 Best Ave.
Oakland, CA 94619

Coyle, James

From: ahmed nasus [anasus1272@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ahmed nasus
131 stillwells corner road
freehold, NJ 07728

Coyle, James

From: Earlene Webster [ehwebster@triad.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Earlene Webster
Pfizer
4300 Filmore Rd.
Greensboro, NC 27409-9721

Coyle, James

From: David Porter [dfp7@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

David Porter
21 Bowker Street
Brookline, MA 02445

Coyle, James

From: Virginia Bennett [vbennett@hawaii.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Virginia Bennett
UHPA
1201 Wilder Ave.
#1704
Honolulu, HI 96822

Coyle, James

From: Nina Rollow [nrowlow@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Nina Rollow
1333 SE Nehalem Street
1333 SE Nehalem Street
Portland, OR 97202

Coyle, James

From: Brenda Haddock [bahaddo@att.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Brenda Haddock
9119 Concert Lane
Indianapolis, IN 46231

Coyle, James

From: Susan FLEMING [susaflem@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Susan FLEMING
Salt Lake City, Utah
PO Box 58858
PO Box 58858
SLC, UT 84158

Coyle, James

From: Erma Lewis [elewisny@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Erma Lewis
1736 63 Street
1736 63 Street
Brooklyn, NY 11204-2801

Coyle, James

From: Marya Small [maryaparral@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:33 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Marya Small
288 Marshallville Rd
Woodbine, NJ 08270

Coyle, James

From: Noah Tenney [noahten@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:30 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Noah Tenney
318 Athol Ave.
Oakland, CA 94606

Coyle, James

From: Marji Mendelsohn [mgm507@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:29 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Marji Mendelsohn
349 Compton Hills Drive
349 Compton Hills Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45215

Coyle, James

From: david caccia [dacaccia@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:29 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr david caccia
none
pob 1788
199 lakeshore dr
honokaa, HI 96727

Coyle, James

From: Kathleen corbett [kcs178@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:29 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Thank you for your careful consideration of all of this.

Gratefully,
Sister Kathleen, SL

Gratefully

Sister Kathleen corbett
Sisters of Loretto
11 St. Anthony Drive
P. O. Box 486
Zuni, NM 87327-0486

Coyle, James

From: C. K. [dudette53147@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:29 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

C. K.
Buckby Rd.
Lake Geneva, WI 53147

Coyle, James

From: Rick Seeley [parsifal10@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:28 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Rick Seeley
571 Cumberland Ave.
Portland, ME 04101

Coyle, James

From: Craig Fiels [Craig@SustainableEconomicSolutions.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:26 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Craig Fiels
Sustainable Economic Solutions
4605 Park Blvd
Oakland, CA 94602

Coyle, James

From: Ernest Callenbach [banyan@berkeley.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

Come on, NRC, the whole world is now watching!

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety. LET'S HEAR YOU SAY SO!

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ernest Callenbach
1963 El Dorado Avenue
1963 El Dorado Avenue, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94707

Coyle, James

From: Richard Kollmar [rtkollmar@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:23 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Richard Kollmar
Pure Land Institute
1101 Iris Ln
1101 Iris Lane
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Coyle, James

From: Cindy Massey [ahhhfinally@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:22 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Cindy Massey
5781 S. Spotswood St.
Spotswood St.
Littleton, CO 80120

Coyle, James

From: Patrick Annabel [parzival1@inbox.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:22 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Comments on the Patrick Annabel
www.whatis-theplan.org
1329 University St.
1329 University St
Walla Walla, WA 99362

Coyle, James

From: s scales [cic763@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:21 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr s scales
none
po box 861
buda, TX 78610

Coyle, James

From: Jayn Avery [jkontiki@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:21 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jayn Avery
180 Zephyr Circle
Floyd, VA 24091

Coyle, James

From: Mark Salamon [marksalamon@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:20 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mark Salamon
851 VIEWRIDGE DRIVE
SW
SAN MATEO, CA 94403

Coyle, James

From: Mana Iluna [manailuna1@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms Mana Iluna
4415 145th Ave. NE H-2
H-2
Bellevue, WA 98007

Coyle, James

From: Gerry Milliken [dolphin@communitynet.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Gerry Milliken
PO Box 1880
Oroville, WA 98844-1880

Coyle, James

From: Chris Cook [aspenrani@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Chris Cook
na
4435 Hastings Drive
4435 Hastings Drive
Boulder, CO 80305

Coyle, James

From: Stacey Smith [goredwings@charter.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Stacey Smith
3008 Shipway Ave.
Long Beach, CA 90808

Coyle, James

From: Blake Payne [bpontheball@att.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Blake Payne
2008 N 46 Terrace
Fort Smith, AR 72904

Coyle, James

From: Barrett Silver [bsilver7@optonline.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:16 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Barrett Silver
15 Hollow Oak Rd
15 Hollow Oak Rd
Chappaqua, NY 10514

Coyle, James

From: ruth lorenz [soarrender@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ruth lorenz
7918 236th st #311
edmonds, WA 98026

Coyle, James

From: Sandra Mardigian [burckintl@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Sandra Mardigian
Self
260 Marion Avenue
260 Marion Ave.
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Coyle, James

From: Deborah Dix [dsdtrd@netzero.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:08 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Deborah Dix
PRIDE
789 Lester Lane
789 Lester Lane
Danville, VA 24540

Coyle, James

From: Dawn Kimble [dawn.kimble@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dawn Kimble
3980 SAINT PETERSBURG ST.
3980 St. Petersburg St.
Boulder, CO 80301

Coyle, James

From: ken gunther [ecocosm@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

Start regulating the nuclear industry NOW.

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr ken gunther
Gaiadigm Publishing, Inc.
11024 161st Street N
11024 161st St. N
jupiter, FL 33478-6188

Coyle, James

From: Ganapati Durgadas [Ganesha@nycap.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:06 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Ganapati Durgadas
261 New Scotland Ave., Apt.2
261 New Scotland Ave., Apt.2
Albany, NY 12208

Coyle, James

From: Mary Montgomery-Crumley [mtcrumley2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:05 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mary Montgomery-Crumley
272 Discovery Way
Sequim, WA 98382

Coyle, James

From: Ronald P Matonti [rmatonti2@optonline.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:05 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Ronald P Matonti
120 Addison Place
120 Addison Place
Medford, NY 11763-1540

Coyle, James

From: Michael J. Wachowiak [yomickey333@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Michael J. Wachowiak
10895 Barnes Ave.
Inver Grove Hts., MN 55077

Coyle, James

From: Luan Le [luanvanle@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Luan Le
3411 Shea Ct.
Arlington, TX 76014

Coyle, James

From: Harbhajan Sandhu [hssandhu32@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Harbhajan Sandhu
11990 PRESILLA ROAD
11990 Presilla rd.
SANTA ROSA VALLEY, CA 93012

Coyle, James

From: Susan Babbitt [philad49@att.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable. In its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Susan Babbitt
319 South Tenth Street
#133
Philadelphia, PA 19107

Coyle, James

From: Dolores Heath [DoloresJHeath41@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:00 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dolores Heath
1309 N 31st St
1309 N 31sr Sr
Colorado Springs, CO 80904

Coyle, James

From: john cevasco [johncevasco@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:00 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

john cevasco
596 millers falls rd.,p.o.box 78
596 millers falls rd.,p.o.box 78
northfield, MA 01360-0078

Coyle, James

From: Stephen Keast [sck11@cornell.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:00 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Senator Stephen Keast

none

PO Box 105, Hurd Rd, Slaterville Springs, NY, 14881 Hurd Rd Slaterville Springs, NY 14881-0105

Coyle, James

From: Molly brewer [bmolly18@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 7:00 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

miss Molly brewer
6439 N. 40th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53209

Coyle, James

From: Pat Morrison [patriciaadele45@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Pat Morrison
2406 W Kansas Ave
2406 W Kansas
Midland, TX 79701

Coyle, James

From: Jeffrey Dickemann [dicke.mannjeff@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Jeffrey Dickemann
2901 Humphrey Avenue
2901 Humphrey Ave.
Richmond, CA 94804-1117

Coyle, James

From: Amber Garlan [agarlan@hammclinic.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Amber Garlan
Green Party of Minnesota
9 West 7th Place, apt# 346
suite 224
St. Paul, MN 55102

Coyle, James

From: Shannon Healey [sh2424@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Shannon Healey
San Carlos, CA 94070
Apt 1
San Carlos, CA 94070

Coyle, James

From: Erma Gluck [egbgcats@optonline.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Erma Gluck
236 Birchwood Rd.
236 Birchwood Rd., Coram, NY 11727
Coram, NY 11727

Coyle, James

From: Patricia Orlinski [bikerpat@mindspring.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable. What in the world would we want to USE radioactive materials? Why not just keep it unmined in the first place?

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Patricia Orlinski
Valley Interfaith Project
10511 W. Kingswood Circle
na
Sun City, AZ 85351-2246

Coyle, James

From: Billy Klock [Wjklock@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Billy Klock
5763 Haney ct
Watauga, TX 76148

Coyle, James

From: Albert Valencia [afitguy@excite.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Albert Valencia
none
15542 Cabot Circle
none
Huntington Beach, CA 92647

Coyle, James

From: Vincent Campanaro [vmc34@drexel.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Vincent Campanaro
4401 Spruce St
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Coyle, James

From: Frank Wyse [wysef@post.harvard.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Frank Wyse
8865 E. Baseline Road, #1501
Mesa, AZ 85209

Coyle, James

From: Jason Misner [jasonmmisner@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jason Misner
1201 Orchid Dr
1045 N Church St
Safety Harbor, FL 34695

Coyle, James

From: Ted Clausen [tjclausen@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ted Clausen
2120 N Pacific Ave #65
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Coyle, James

From: Joan Wharton [Rosewind3@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Joan Wharton
6708 Winterwood
Dallas, TX 75248

Coyle, James

From: Julie Alley [juliesbooks@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Julie Alley
3553 Atlantic Ave.
Ste.353
Long Beach, CA 90807

Coyle, James

From: Bill Leavitt [WilliamLeavitt@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Bill Leavitt
none
349 12 St
4R
Brooklyn, NY 11215-5065

Coyle, James

From: Maradel Gale [mkgale@uoregon.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Maradel Gale
239 Parfitt Way SW, Unit 2A
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

Coyle, James

From: David Fogle [dfogle2002@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

David Fogle
2320 Farley St.
Castro Valley, CA 94546

Coyle, James

From: Kevin Parks [doctorparks@optonline.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:49 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Kevin Parks
823 Trenton Avenue
823 Trenton Avenue
POINT PLEASANT, NJ 08742

Coyle, James

From: Elizabeth Guise [elizabeth@secretweapon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Elizabeth Guise
11965 Montana Ave., #13
Los Angeles, CA 90049-5039

Coyle, James

From: Derek Gendvil [dgendvil@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now. Thank you!

Sincerely,
Derek Gendvil
Las Vegas, NV

Derek Gendvil
9030 W. Sahara Ave. #360
Las Vegas, NV 89117

Coyle, James

From: Nicholas Totten [njtd36@mizzou.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Nicholas Totten
Students for Progressive Action
1403 E Walnut
208 Melbourne St
Columbia, MO 65201

Coyle, James

From: Hans Leo [leosan@crocker.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Hans Leo
7 Valley Street
Northampton, MA 01060

Coyle, James

From: Rachael Denny [stormdragon71@netscape.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

I am writng, this time, because it seems to me that the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, while moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this means putting nuclear utilities ahead of people, and it needs to stop now. Protecting the health and well-being of our people, our communities, and our ecosystems should be the top priority.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Ms. Rachael Denny
Green Party
4082 Interlake Road
Bradley, CA 93426-6933

Coyle, James

From: Evan and Elaine Hazard [eehazard@paulbunyan.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable. Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety. This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people.

I am worried about my kids and grandkids, not about enabling the rich to get richer. This must stop now.

Dr. Evan and Elaine Hazard
Democracy in Action
3119 Apple Tree Ct NW
NA
Bemidji, MN 56601-2107

Coyle, James

From: Linda Wearne [lin@saber.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Linda Wearne
NA
P. O. Box 166
P. O. Box 166, Laytonville, Ca. 95454
Laytonville, CA 95454

Coyle, James

From: Sherry Marsh [MTASJ@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to *redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation*. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Sherry Marsh
5030 Alicante Way
5030 Alicante Way
Oceanside, CA 92056-5159

Coyle, James

From: Stephen Koepp [stevebetsyk1@frontier.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Stephen Koepp
10621 64th Pl. W.
Mukilteo, WA 98275

Coyle, James

From: Therese Ryan [mandm2872@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Therese Ryan
37310 36th St. E
Palmdale, CA 93550-2569

Coyle, James

From: Marjorie Worthington [maworth@skynetbb.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Marjorie Worthington
1947 Clovercrest Street
Enumclaw, WA 98022

Coyle, James

From: Julia Hathaway [Beaniebabylover@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Julia Hathaway
25 Greystone MHP
Veazie, ME 04401

Coyle, James

From: Chip Phillips [cphillips5@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Chip Phillips
2033 N Beachwood Dr
12
Los Angeles, CA 90068-3430

Coyle, James

From: Walter Koenig [wkoenig2@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Walter Koenig
Retired
97 Gourley Ave.
Clifton, NJ 07013

Coyle, James

From: Hannah Bloch [hannah@newview.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:38 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Hannah Bloch
none
2 Gregory Lane
none
Acton, MA 01720

Coyle, James

From: William Johnston [wj3@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation? .

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. William Johnston
SoMdCares
3458 Holland Cliffs Road
Huntingtown, MD 20639

Coyle, James

From: Darryl Warner [darryl.warner@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Darryl Warner
318 Beach 85th street
#GO3C
Far Rockaway, NY 11693-1442

Coyle, James

From: Catherine M. Jones [catherine.jones@morganstanley.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Miss Catherine M. Jones
N/A
100 Dreiser Loop, apt. 3H
apt. 3H
Bronx, NY 10475-2660

Coyle, James

From: carleen mulloy [carleenmulloy@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:36 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms carleen mulloy
self employed
6725 n oregon
6725 n oregon
kansas city, MO 64151

Coyle, James

From: Amy Agigian [agigian@mac.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:36 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Amy Agigian
Suffolk University
33 Corinthian Road
33 Corinthian Road
Somerville, MA 02144

Coyle, James

From: David Milholland [encanto@ochcom.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. David Milholland
2000 NE 42nd #1
Portland, OR 97213

Coyle, James

From: Frank Cerasuolo [fmcera@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Frank Cerasuolo
58 Bache Ave
58 Bache Ave
Staten Island, NY 10306

Coyle, James

From: william tondr [wtoner@twcny.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr william tondr
9 highland ave
9 highland ave
mcgraw, NY 13101

Coyle, James

From: Deb Federin [dfederin@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Deb Federin
6611 legend ridge tr
6611 legend ridge
Longmont, CO 80503-7189

Coyle, James

From: John Krasowski [jkrasows@maine.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:33 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. John Krasowski
332 Summit Street
Portland, ME 04103

Coyle, James

From: Paul L Johnson [paulnmina@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:33 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Paul L Johnson
Family
7545 W. Pierson
Waheed Goth, Public School Rd, Mirpurkhas Phoenix, AZ 85033-1232

Coyle, James

From: Jerry Cecere [skyy105@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:32 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr Jerry Cecere
Death Wish
105 Lost Lake Court
105 Lost Lake Court
Folsom, CA 95630

Coyle, James

From: Timothy Keeler [timwsiy@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:31 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Timothy Keeler
16723 74th Ave NE
KENMORE, WA 98028

Coyle, James

From: Marie Moore [sunnylandseeds@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:30 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Park Ranger Marie Moore
Sunnyland Seeds
p.o. box 385
P. O. Box 385
paradox, CO 81429

Coyle, James

From: William Dolly [bdolly1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:29 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. William Dolly
Suwannee Democratic Party
19809 89th Rd.
McAlpin, FL 32062

Coyle, James

From: sherry landsman [sherry25@mac.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:29 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

sherry landsman
410 w. 24th st. #6J
NY, NY 10011

Coyle, James

From: Michael Daniels [michaeldaniels@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:28 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Michael Daniels
102 Arcadia Place #1107
San Antonio, TX 78209-5858

Coyle, James

From: alice speakman [alspeak@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:26 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

alice speakman
8932 biscayne
huntington bch, CA 92646

Coyle, James

From: Romola Georgia [rgeorgia@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:26 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Romola Georgia
3445 Tippawingo
rgeorgia@gmail.com
Palo Alto, CA 94306

Coyle, James

From: Sarah B Stewart [sarahbstewart@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr Sarah B Stewart
self
207 Appleton St
207 Appleton St
Cambridge, MA 02138-1345

Coyle, James

From: Aliza Keddem [alizak@pacifier.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:23 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Aliza Keddem
none
36 NE 76 Avenue
none
Portland, OR 97213-6323

Coyle, James

From: Arthur Leibowitz [arthurleibowitz@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:22 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr. Arthur Leibowitz
322 Lake Shore Road
Putnam Valley, NY 10579

Coyle, James

From: Deanna Homer [deannahomer@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:21 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Deanna Homer
2105 E Marcus
Stillwater, OK 74075-8636

Coyle, James

From: Suzanne Kirby [skirby3215@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:20 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Suzanne Kirby
PO Box 1448
8 Peninsula Dr.
Sag Harbor, NY 11963

Coyle, James

From: Randall Paske [panacea42@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Randall Paske
3958 Warwick Boulevard
Kansas City, MO 64111

Coyle, James

From: Matthew Quellas [mquellas@juno.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Matthew Quellas
4143 Perlita Ave
Apt A
Los Angeles, CA 90039-1334

Coyle, James

From: Lynn Walker [mooncrone@mac.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Lynn Walker
NIRS
15901 Corsica Ave
Cleveland, OH 44110

Coyle, James

From: Luke Farrell [Luke19042004@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:17 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Luke Farrell
114 creek rd apt 1E
114 creek rd apt 1E
haskell, AR 72015-1472

Coyle, James

From: Wilma Ralls [wilmaralls@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:16 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MS Wilma Ralls
1352 oak view circle #111
#111
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Coyle, James

From: David Williams [devwilliams@juno.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:16 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Elizabeth and David Williams
Unitarian Universalist Church of Asheville, NC
148 Murdock Ave
148 MURdock Ave , Asheville , NC
Asheville, NC 28801

Coyle, James

From: Kathy Morey [katch@prodigy.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kathy Morey
112 Mohegan Rd
Shelton, CT 06484-2448

Coyle, James

From: Barry Snitkin [bsotar@frontiernet.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Barry Snitkin
Social Justice Alliance
POB 2565
CAVE JUNCTION, OR 97523

Coyle, James

From: k Olson [servimailster@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

k Olson
21325 Heron Dr
21325 Heron Dr.
Bodega Bay, CA 94923

Coyle, James

From: Kenneth Bird [Birdman@rochester.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Kenneth Bird
County of Monroe
131 Aragon Avenue
Rochester, NY 14622-1616

Coyle, James

From: John Satchell [jasatchell@surewest.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr & Mrs John Satchell
me, myself, & I
4425 The Court
4425 The Court
Sacramento, CA 95821-2940

Coyle, James

From: julia Golden [jadeinsf@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

julia Golden
750 gonzalez
san francisco, CA 94132-2202

Coyle, James

From: Matthew Franck [cnjmatt@optonline.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Matthew Franck
119 Livingston Ave Apt 5G
119 Livingston Ave Apt 5G
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-2456

Coyle, James

From: Werner Bergman [wernerbergman@frontier.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Werner Bergman
Retired scientist
26910 92nd Ave NW
C-5 PMB-508
stanwood, WA 98292

Coyle, James

From: Anne Armistead [songdance@swva.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Anne Armistead
201 Woods Gap Rd SE
201 Woods Gap Rd
Floyd, VA 24091

Coyle, James

From: Betty Tagge [batfat@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Betty Tagge
Private
7200 E Quincy Ave #109
7200 E Quincy Ave #109
Denver, CO 80237-2250

Coyle, James

From: Pandora Edmonston [pandora@yosemite.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Pandora Edmonston
4279 Grist rd.
Mariposa, CA 95338-8701

Coyle, James

From: Don Pew [nobrainsurgeon022@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Don Pew
Human race
348 Indiana Ave
348 Indiana Ave Girard OH
Girard, OH 44420

Coyle, James

From: Susan Evilsizer [cybertigress2@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms Susan Evilsizer
20529 Brookstone trl
20529 Brookstone Trl
Cleveland, OH 44130

Coyle, James

From: Linda Schimpf [lschimpf@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:08 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MS Linda Schimpf
116 Oakridge Drive
116 Oakridge Drive
Rochester, NY 14617

Coyle, James

From: Mary Camele [m_e_camele@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Mary Camele
550 E. Loveland Ave.
Loveland, OH 45140

Coyle, James

From: David Burkhart [merlinbirdhawk@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr David Burkhart
self
Sunnyside Road
none
Salem, OR 97306

Coyle, James

From: Sandra Joos [joosgalefamily@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr Sandra Joos
individual
4259 SW Patrick Pl
none
Portland, OR 97239-7202

Coyle, James

From: Ricardo Corrales [rcorrales50@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Magister Ricardo Corrales
Consultor Independiente
Urb. APROVIA, casa 24
La Aurora, Ulloa
Heredia, CO 10101

Coyle, James

From: mike manetas [mikemanetas@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mike manetas
1094 birch ave
mckinleyville, CA 95519

Coyle, James

From: Suzanne Hickman [xuxan51@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Suzanne Hickman
po box 2392
Valdez, AK 99686

Coyle, James

From: Vicki Bookless [vickib2004@charter.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Vicki Bookless
890 Del Rio Avenue
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

Coyle, James

From: Fred Lavy [fred-cheryl@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Fred Lavy
524 East Wolfe St
524 East Wolfe St
Harrisonburg, VA 22802-4822

Coyle, James

From: Linda A. DeStefano [ldestefano3@twcnny.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 6:00 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Linda A. DeStefano
not representing organization
5031 Onondaga Rd.
5031 Onondaga Rd., Syracuse
Syracuse, NY 13215

Coyle, James

From: bernardo alayza mujica [beralmu@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr bernardo alayza mujica
durand bernaes 133 208
surquillo, IA 51101

Coyle, James

From: Charles and Joan Pratt [cpratt@exeter.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Charles and Joan Pratt
7 Wentworth St.
66 Rowell Rd. East
Exeter, NH 03833

Coyle, James

From: bernardo alayza mujica [beralmu@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr bernardo alayza mujica
durand bernaes 133 208
surquillo, IA 51111

Coyle, James

From: bernardo alayza mujica [beralmu@yahoo.es]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr bernardo alayza mujica
durand bernaes 133 208
surquillo, IA 51101

Coyle, James

From: Lea Foushee [lfoushee@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lea Foushee
NAWO
5093 Keats Ave N.
5093 Keats Ave. N
Lake Elmo, MN 55042

Coyle, James

From: Scott Nass, MD MPA [scottenass@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Scott Nass, MD MPA
Ventura County Medical Center
285 N Ventura Ave Apt 23
Ventura, CA 93001

Coyle, James

From: Jill Blaisdell [ablaisdell@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jill Blaisdell
democracy in action
5152 Earl Dr.
5152 earl Dr.
La Canada, CA 91011

Coyle, James

From: Marcia Lane [catehokte@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comiment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Marcia Lane
2105 Willow Oak Rd
Mulberry, FL 33860

Coyle, James

From: Helen Hanna [helenhanna@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, the NRC is attempting to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety. Nowhere in any of its statutory documents does it say that the purpose of NRC regulation is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Helen Hanna
none
183 Gifford Way
none
Sacramento, CA 95864 6907

Coyle, James

From: Ken Burke [ninak@mills.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Ken Burke
Mills College
5000 MacArthur Blvd
Oakland, CA 94613

Coyle, James

From: Jessica Wheeler [jwhee2@tulane.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Jessica Wheeler
n/a
6038 Cason Way
n/a
Lakeland, FL 33812

Coyle, James

From: John LaMonica [jalamon@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. John LaMonica
395 Sylvan Byway
395 Sylvan Byway
Pisgah Forest, NC 28768

Coyle, James

From: Louis Cox [jlouiscox@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Given this new language, if the NRC ever did try to shut down an unsafe nuclear reactor, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Louis Cox
360 Toad Rd.
Charlotte, VT 05445-9168

Coyle, James

From: William Rizer [rizerwd@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. William Rizer
W. D. Rizer Consulting
9775 Highway 47
Carlton, OR 97111-9521

Coyle, James

From: Leslie Feuille [lfeuille@capaccess.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Leslie Feuille
1831 California St., NW
Apt. 22
Washington, DC 20009-1830

Coyle, James

From: Gabrielle Kayser [gkayser@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:50 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Gabrielle Kayser
2 Pine Street
2 Pine Street
Hicksville, NY 11801

Coyle, James

From: Paul Blundell [inscrutable.g@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:50 PM.
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Paul Blundell
1259 Indian Creek Rd
Mineral, VA 23117

Coyle, James

From: Timothy Moxley [mox641@twcny.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:49 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Editor Timothy Moxley
1188 Cty Rt. 20
1134 Stevi Shay Lane
Oswego, NY 13126

Coyle, James

From: John Sefton [johnjuly@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

John Sefton
PO Box 714
20462 Rose Canyon Rd
Trabuco Canyon, CA 92678

Coyle, James

From: Jeffery Garcia [jeffery@mcn.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jeffery Garcia
NIRS
PO Box 1166
Mendocino, CA 95460

Coyle, James

From: Sister Carol Boschert [carolcpps@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Sister Sister Carol Boschert
St. Mary's Institute
206 N. Main #312
206 N. Main #312
O'Fallon, MO 63366-2203

Coyle, James

From: Nicole Weber [nicole4770@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Nicole Weber
7621 Paradise Beach
Pasadena, MD 21122-3514

Coyle, James

From: Nancy Hiestand [nancya0624@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Nancy Hiestand
526 South Campus Way, Davis
Davis
Davis, CA 95616-3523

Coyle, James

From: phoury chhun [phoury_chhun@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

phoury chhun
seiu
914 white knoll dr# 5
914 white knoll dr#5 la, ca90012
los angeles, CA 90012-1329

Coyle, James

From: Joseph Wasserman [joewass64@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Joseph Wasserman
87 Shadow Lane
87 Shadow Lane
West Hartford, CT 06110

Coyle, James

From: Chris McCarty [reson8tor@mac.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Chris McCarty
2909 S. Ocean Blvd. #3C
2909 S. Ocean Blvd. #3C
Highland Beach, FL 33487-1819

Coyle, James

From: john ford [jandbford@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr.. john ford
US Army, retired
2402 Baylor4
2402 baylor
Roswell, NM 88203

Coyle, James

From: Michael Brilowski [mikebrilowski@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Michael Brilowski
1375 County Road ZZ
1375 County Road ZZ
AMHERST JUNCTION, WI 54407

Coyle, James

From: Michael Franz [mf0303@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Michael Franz
MoveOn.org
1850 Whirlaway Ct. SE
1850 Whirlaway Ct. SE, Grand Rapids, MI 49546 Grand Rapids, MI 49546

Coyle, James

From: kevin orme [bi670@scn.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

kevin orme
502 N 80th
seattle, WA 98103

Coyle, James

From: Brian Ainsley [Brian.Ainsley@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Brian Ainsley
1800 Rutledge Court
Fort Collins, CO 80526

Coyle, James

From: Matthew Iskra [matt.iskra@symetra.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Matthew Iskra
7205 Dayton Ave N
Seattle, WA 98103

Coyle, James

From: Lauri Rice [porkchop1010@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Lauri Rice
8461 NW 118th Terrace
Ocala, FL 34482

Coyle, James

From: bernardo alayza mujica [beralmu@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr bernardo alayza mujica
durand bernaes 133 208
surquillo, IA 51101

Coyle, James

From: Vicki Kruschwitz [kruschus@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Vicki Kruschwitz
Nuclear Information and Resource Service
114 Kingston Drive
114 Kingston Drive
Waco, TX 76712

Coyle, James

From: Tim Duda [timduda@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Tim Duda
American Federation of Teachers (ret)
340 Queen Anne Court
340 Queen Anne Court
San Antonio, TX 78209-6625

Coyle, James

From: Andrew Leavenworth [drewlicious1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to PROTECT the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Doctor Andrew Leavenworth
8909 W. 24th Street
8909 W. 24th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90034-2009

Coyle, James

From: Debra Saude [deanndeb@centurytel.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Debra Saude
1050 Pleasant Valley Rd
1050 Pleasant Valley Rd
Sweet Home, OR 97386

Coyle, James

From: Lynda Pauling [lmp5812@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lynda Pauling
5812 Olene Ave N
5812 Olene Ave N
Oak Park Heights, MN 55082

Coyle, James

From: Denise Brennan [dbre657144@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Denise Brennan
2692 Patrick Henry, Apt. 101
Auburn Hills, MI 48326

Coyle, James

From: Anthony Capobianco [acapobia@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:38 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Anthony Capobianco
Nuclear Information and Resource Service
101 Keystone CT, Ste 203
Ste 203
Bethel Park, PA 15102-4612

Coyle, James

From: Kate Kenner [faunesiegel@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:38 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kate Kenner
31 Woodman St.
31 Woodman St.
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130

Coyle, James

From: howard howell [sunshineheartsong@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

doctor howard howell
U.S. environmental alliance
225 apple lane
225 apple lane
rohnert park, GU 94928

Coyle, James

From: Jerry Bloomer [gbloomer@gwtc.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jerry Bloomer
2146 Minnekahta Avenue
Hot Springs, SD 57747

Coyle, James

From: Susan Wingfield-Ritter [susannirs@johnhritter.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Susan Wingfield-Ritter
4405 Hedionda Ct.
San Diego, CA 92117-3721

Coyle, James

From: David Regan [dregan02@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:36 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. David Regan
2455 NW Quimby St. #103
2455 nw quimby st.
Portland, OR 97210

Coyle, James

From: Bob Burr [Bobburr@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:36 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Bob Burr
Bob Burr For U.S. Senate
1130 40th St
Bellingham, WA 98229-3118

Coyle, James

From: john martinez [inmart5@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:36 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr john martinez
Aztlán Media Kollektive
323 n. soto st.
323 n. soto st. #70
los angeles, CA 90033

Coyle, James

From: Lana May [lanamay300@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lana May
300 S. Edward St
300 S. Edward St.
Mt. Prospect, IL 60056-3418

Coyle, James

From: Michael Sherber [sherbermike@cs.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Michael Sherber
20 Woodmont Rd.
20 Woodmont Rd.
Avon, CT 06001

Coyle, James

From: Louis Oddi [shakeastick2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

THE COST OF UNWI Louis Oddi
The Body of Life
8645 Milwaukee Avenue
Niles, IL 60714

Coyle, James

From: Pamela Gardiner [rinchen.johnston@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Pamela Gardiner
organization
9 Golf Drive
9 Golf Drive
Clayton, GA 30525

Coyle, James

From: Kristen Van Tassell [kristenand4@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Kristen Van Tassell
private citizen
6913 Confederate Ridge Lane
Centreville, VA 20121-2569

Coyle, James

From: Darina Stoyanova [darinajoy@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Founder Darina Stoyanova
Surprise Foundation
PO Box 1381
PO Box 1381
Ojai, CA 93024

Coyle, James

From: Timothy Raymond [raymont@cityofrochester.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:33 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Timothy Raymond
45-1/2 Marshall St
Rochester, NY 14607

Coyle, James

From: Bonnie Faith-Smith [whiteowl1@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:32 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Bonnie Faith-Smith
none
290A Washington Street
Cambridge, MA 02139

Coyle, James

From: Forest Shomer [inspass@whidbey.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:30 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Forest Shomer
PO Box 639
Port Townsend, WA 98368

Coyle, James

From: Glenda Spencer [gspencer400@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:29 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MS Glenda Spencer
186 Grey Ghost Rd.
Harpers Ferry, WV 25425-4924

Coyle, James

From: John Lemmon [jlemmon@its.bldrdoc.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:29 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

John Lemmon
154 Cumberland Gap Road
Nederland, CO 80466

Coyle, James

From: Jose Luis Greco [grecomusica@comunired.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:29 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jose Luis Greco
8 Overlook Terrace
Danbury, CT 06811

Coyle, James

From: Les Ego [rev-les-ego@online.ie]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:28 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Les Ego Les Ego
speciesurvivalibrary
151 First Avenue
151 First Avenue, NYC 10003
New York, NY 10003-2965

Coyle, James

From: Les Ego [rev-les-ego@online.ie]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:28 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Les Ego Les Ego
speciesurvivalibrary
151 First Avenue
151 First Avenue, NYC 10003
New York, NY 10003-2965

Coyle, James

From: Jane Feldman [feldman.jane@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:27 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Jane Feldman
self
5901 Martita Ave
5901 Martita Ave
Las Vegas, NV 89108

Coyle, James

From: Eileen Siedman [eileensi@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:27 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Eileen Siedman
Democracy for America-Marin
12 Lomita Drive
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Coyle, James

From: Mha Atma S Khalsa [earthactionnetwork@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:26 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: My comments: NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

As a very concerned American citizen and taxpayer I appreciate your considering my comments, below:

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is absolutely unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Mha Atma S Khalsa
1536 S Crest Dr
1536 Crest Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90035-3314

Coyle, James

From: Virginia Pratt [vpratt@esacboston.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:26 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Virginia Pratt
7 Segel Street
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130

Coyle, James

From: Edmund Jones [texicalibues@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:25 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Edmund Jones
PO Box 2201
Canyon Lake, TX 78133

Coyle, James

From: Patricia Chernoff [patriciachernoff@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:25 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Patricia Chernoff
Morningside Friends Meeting
771 West End Ave. #10K
771 West End Ave. #10K
New York, NY 10025-5539

Coyle, James

From: Mary Lou Pierron [maryloupierron@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mary Lou Pierron
Episcopal Church of USA
321 Hillside Avenue
321 Hillside Ave
Needham, MA 02494

Coyle, James

From: Vivian Sovran [Vitamatta@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Vivian Sovran
233 NW 48th St
233 NW 48th St
Seattle, WA 98107

Coyle, James

From: William Reid [bill.dreid@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. William Reid
Concerned Grandfather
209 So. Cameron St.
209 S Cameron St
Hillsborough, NC 27278-2504

Coyle, James

From: Cheryl A Erb [canne826@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:23 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Cheryl A Erb
Garden Home Designs
1930 Stewart St. #D6
1930 Stewart St.
Santa Monica, CA 90404

Coyle, James

From: Rajan Wadhwani [etherboss@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:23 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Rajan Wadhwani
4312 Main St. Apt. 206
4312 Main St., Apt. 206
Philadelphia, PA 19127-1530

Coyle, James

From: Charles Johnson [johnsonc20@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:23 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Charles Johnson
5031 SE Haig St.
Portland, OR 97206

Coyle, James

From: tlaloc Tokuda [tlalocct@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:23 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr tlaloc Tokuda
Conservation Council for Hawaii
73-4599A Kukuki St.
73-4599A Kukuki St., Kailua Kona, HI 96740, USA Kailua Kona, HI 96740

Coyle, James

From: Dr Ronald Reed [windriveracupuncture@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:21 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr Dr Ronald Reed
444 Chase Rd
Columbus, OH 43214

Coyle, James

From: Alan Fatemi [mir7094@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:20 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr Alan Fatemi
P O Box 53
P O Box 53
Clatskanie, OR 97016

Coyle, James

From: Blair Sandler [dr.lapin@drlapin.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:20 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Blair Sandler
319 Virginia Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94110-5150

Coyle, James

From: AURORA INSURRIAGA [ainsurriaga4432@wowway.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr & Mrs AURORA INSURRIAGA
na
9729 S AVE H
9729 S AVE H
CHICAGO, IL 60617-5545

Coyle, James

From: Carlo Papolizio [c_papolizio@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Carlo Papolizio
160 9th Avenue
Estell Manor, NJ 08319

Coyle, James

From: Barbara Viken [baviken@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Barbara Viken
individual
1750 Washington St. #4
1750 Washington St. #4
San Francisco, CA 94109

Coyle, James

From: Gail J. Reams [greams@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels. .

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Gail J. Reams
3114 West Avenue
Austin, TX 78705-2123

Coyle, James

From: drew hempel [drewhempel@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:16 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. drew hempel
14929 Old Guslander Tr N
14929 Old Guslander Tr N
Marine, MN 55047

Coyle, James

From: wendy Dannett [wen333@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:16 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms wendy Dannett
self
175 west 93 street
175 west 93 street
new york, NY 10025

Coyle, James

From: Cheryl Willis [cherroe@juno.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:15 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Cheryl Willis
138 Hearst Avenue
138 Hearst Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94131

Coyle, James

From: Roger Wechsler [roger@cffresh.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:15 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Roger Wechsler
PO 202
Bow, WA 98232

Coyle, James

From: Linda Greene [lgreene@bloomington.in.us]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:15 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Linda Greene
none
7487 N. John Young Rd.
none
Unionville, IN 47468

Coyle, James

From: Tatiana Torres [tatianatorres@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:15 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Tatiana Torres
cra 11 N° 61-95
L.A., CA 90099

Coyle, James

From: Zeljko Cipris [zqipris@pacific.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr Zeljko Cipris
828 Dave Brubeck Way
828 Dave Brubeck Way Apt 7
Stockton, CA 95204

Coyle, James

From: Beverly Harlan [sai108@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Beverly Harlan
1020 Kingston road
apt 3K
mt shasta, CA 96067-2265

Coyle, James

From: Pastor Tim Redfern [jazzmantim@weirdness.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Pastor Pastor Tim Redfern
Disciple of Jesus Christ
P.O. Box 119
786 Chris Barney Rd.
Dryden, VA 24243

Coyle, James

From: Jennifer Hayes [xandysmom@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jennifer Hayes
2312 St. James Pl.
Modesto, CA 95350

Coyle, James

From: Danda Sweetwater [dsweetwater@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Danda Sweetwater
5535 SE 109th
Portland, OR 97266

Coyle, James

From: Leslie Schwarzbach [l-schwarzbach@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Leslie Schwarzbach
580 East Old Elm Rd.
Lake Forest, IL
Lake Forest, IL 60045

Coyle, James

From: Mary R. Wolfe [omwolfmar@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Mary R. Wolfe
None
2 Oakridge Court
Lutherville, MD 21093-5927

Coyle, James

From: Randy Vannoy [randyjvann@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Randy Vannoy
25327 153rd st ct e
25327 153rd st ct e
Buckley, WA 98321

Coyle, James

From: Josephine Niemann [josephinessnd@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Josephine Niemann
School Sisters of Notre Dame
320 E. Ripa Ave.
320 E. Ripa Ave
St. Louis, MO 63125

Coyle, James

From: Bernie Zelazny [bdz@apcwizard.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Bernie Zelazny
PO Box 523
Alpine, TX 79831

Coyle, James

From: Ellen N. Duell [duellsjeln@yellowsprings.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Ellen N. Duell
4650 Lamont Rd.
Yellow Springs, OH 45387

Coyle, James

From: Sue Merris [suemerris@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Sue Merris
748 Meadow Branch rd
748 Meadow Branch rd
Pittsboro, NC 27312

Coyle, James

From: Andre Ferrer [aferrer@serv.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Andre Ferrer
4311 5th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98105

Coyle, James

From: Martha Vinick [vinickm@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Martha Vinick
Global Network
5551 Dunrobin Dr. #4301
Sarasota, FL 34238

Coyle, James

From: Marie Russell-Barker [russell.464@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MRS. Marie Russell-Barker
4941 West Jackson Boulevard.
4941 West Jackson Boulevard.
Chicago, IL 60644

Coyle, James

From: Doris Zumpe [dzumpe@learnlink.emory.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:08 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Doris Zumpe
2495 Hunting Valley Drive
Decatur, GA 30033-4227

Coyle, James

From: Gene Fialkoff [gene@madriver.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Gene Fialkoff
1667 bragg hill rd
fayston, VT 05673

Coyle, James

From: Patricia Glover [pglover1@twcny.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:06 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Patricia Glover
28 Fairlane Drive
Canton, NY 13617

Coyle, James

From: Jeanne Lamar [sunnylamar2000@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:06 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Jeanne Lamar
543 Crawford Dr.
543 Crawford Dr.
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

Coyle, James

From: Marie-Louise Jackson-Miller [marieljm1961@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:05 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Marie-Louise Jackson-Miller
Boston Branch of Women's International League for Peace and Free
63 Gay Street
Quincy, MA 02169-6602

Coyle, James

From: Doris Lehr [dorislehr@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Doris Lehr
5813 213 St
Bayside Hills, NY 11364 1827

Coyle, James

From: Dena McKitrick [denamckitrick@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety. Isn't it about time that the public safety actually be considered before the nuclear industry?

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Dena McKitrick
self
5120 Elmer Way
5120 Elmer Way
Sacramento, CA 95822

Coyle, James

From: Florence Steichen [Steichenfm@usfamily.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Thank you for your attention to this.
Florence Steichen

T

Member Florence Steichen
Women Against Military Madness
1440 Randolph Av. #213
St. Paul, MN
St. Paul, MN 55105-2562

Coyle, James

From: Geri Collecchia [GeriColle@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Geri Collecchia
9709 U.S. Hwy 42
Prospect, KY 40059-8801

Coyle, James

From: mark leiner [themark56@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mark leiner
680 long hill ave
680 long hill ave
shelton, CT 06484

Coyle, James

From: Joseph Jacovino [bluesriot@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

joe jacovino Joseph Jacovino
Concerned Citizen
116 Lilyan St
116 Lilyan St Waldwick NJ
Waldwick, NJ 07463

Coyle, James

From: Allen Gerhardt [algerhardt@windstream.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Allen Gerhardt
15012 NW CR 231
Gainesville, FL 32609-4050

Coyle, James

From: Dale Must [dalemust@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Dale Must
527 vine St Apt 205
527 Vine St Apt 205
johnstown, PA 15901

Coyle, James

From: mark cohen [markd.cohen@frontier.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

organic certific mark cohen
ohio ecological food and farming association
12788 new england rd
12788 new england rd
amesville, OH 45711

Coyle, James

From: Vanessa Nixon Klein [vanessa@herbsofgrace.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:00 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Vanessa Nixon Klein
301 Young Rd
Mossyrock, WA 98564

Coyle, James

From: Elizabeth Guthrie [lizguth1@frontiernet.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 5:00 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Elizabeth Guthrie
951 Summitville Drive
Webster, NY 14580

Coyle, James

From: Ian Shelley [ianjs@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ian Shelley
9158 SW Wilshire St.
Portland, OR 97225

Coyle, James

From: Deborah Veneziale [deby.veneziale@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Deborah Veneziale
Independent
7 W 41st Ave.
#413
San Mateo, CA 94403

Coyle, James

From: Kennethb Barta [krbar@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kennethb Barta
230 Brunswick Avenue
230 Brunswick Avenue
Spotswood, NJ 08884

Coyle, James

From: Erik Hoffner [ehoffner@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Erik Hoffner
795 Ashfield Mtn Rd
795 Ashfield Mtn Rd
Ashfield, MA 01330

Coyle, James

From: Edward Butler [epb223@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Edward Butler
Private citizen
36 E. 69th St.
#1B
New York, NY 10021

Coyle, James

From: Donald Figge [miraval@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Donald Figge
Self
6645 E. Michigan Ave.
6645 E. Mixhigan Ave., Fresno, CA 93727
Fresno, CA 93727

Coyle, James

From: Brian Rasche [brasche@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Brian Rasche
702 E Amelia St
702 E Amelia St
Orlando, FL 32803

Coyle, James

From: Dan Cosby [cosbydp@missouri.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Dan Cosby
4015 N. Wappel Dr.
Columbia, MO 65203

Coyle, James

From: Janice Dlugosz [gjjak52@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Janice Dlugosz
409 Compass Ave
Beachwood, NJ 08722

Coyle, James

From: Phil Lusk [plusk@pipeline.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Phil Lusk
None
82 Westwind Drive
82 Westwind Drive
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Coyle, James

From: Ray Morris [rmorris@bak.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ray Morris
7319 Pembroke Ave.
7319 Pembroke Ave.
Bakersfield, CA 93308

Coyle, James

From: Anita Buffer [mybuff.net@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

The NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications while it's moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation.

This is unacceptable.

The purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

If the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be?

If the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

The government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest.

In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people.

This must stop. Now.

Anita Buffer
Concerned Citizen
530 Winding Way
Winding Way
Warminster, PA 18974-5453

Coyle, James

From: Thomas Giblin [twgiblin@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Thomas Giblin
130 Ahern Rd
130 Ahern Rd
Binghamton, NY 13903

Coyle, James

From: Steven Handwerker [drstevnehandwerker@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr Steven Handwerker

Boca Raton, FL 33488

Coyle, James

From: Edward LeBlanc [el@twenty15.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Edward LeBlanc
205 Irvine St.
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Coyle, James

From: Richard Booth [rtbooth6@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is slow in implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine nuclear regulation in a way that is unacceptable.

In its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

The government should not put the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest, and the NRC should not put the interests of or encouragement of nuclear utilities ahead of the safety of the American people. We count on you to put our safety first!

Thank you.

Richard Booth
26250 Dreschfield
Grosse Ile, MI 48138

Coyle, James

From: Nydia Leaf [nyleaf@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Nydia Leaf
Women's Intl. League for Peace & Freedom
46 West 95 Street
46 West 95 St.
New York, NY 10025-6718

Coyle, James

From: Bertram Donn [1donnb@mindspring.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Bertram Donn
19 Woodland Way
Greenbelt, MD 20770

Coyle, James

From: stuart wexelbaum [stuwexel@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr stuart wexelbaum
144 N 11th St.
144 n 11th St brooklyn, ny
Brooklyn, NY, NY 11211

Coyle, James

From: Bernadine Young [bernadineyoung@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Bernadine Young
27 Highland St.
Gloucester, MA 01930

Coyle, James

From: Brent Rocks [brent_rocks@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Brent Rocks
1518 SW Upper Hall st
Portland, OR 97201-6132

Coyle, James

From: Carol George [cgeo@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Carol George
4124 White Pine Dr.
Raleigh, NC 27612

Coyle, James

From: Tim Wagner [tim1728@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Tim Wagner

Columbus, OH 43224-4251

Coyle, James

From: Terry Ermini [savitriermini@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:52 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Terry Ermini
none
2330 Hurley Way
2443 Fair Oaks Blvd., #206
Sacramento, CA 95825-3542

Coyle, James

From: Patricia O'Leary [psoleary@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:52 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms Patricia O'Leary
6010 Westchester Park
6010 Westchester Park
College Park,, MD 20740

Coyle, James

From: Doug Landau [popcomic@tampabay.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:52 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

Make

m the NRC represent the people of this country rather than corporate interests.

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Doug Landau
150 73rd St. S.
St. Petersburg, FL 33707

Coyle, James

From: Beth Cole [bravehoratio@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:52 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Beth Cole
4698 Audubon Rd
Detroit, MI 48224-2797

Coyle, James

From: Lawrence Schuchart [schuchart@q.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lawrence Schuchart
6204 N. Morton
Spokane, WA 99208

Coyle, James

From: Elizabeth Johnson [elizabethmcj@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Elizabeth Johnson
33 Washington Street
Newton, MA 02458-2228

Coyle, James

From: June Adler [juneadler@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. June Adler
no organization
509 N. 7th St.
509 N. 7th St.
Alpine, TX 79830

Coyle, James

From: Tobe Carey [video@hvc.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:50 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Tobe Carey
PO Box 194
Glenford, NY 12433

Coyle, James

From: JENIFER MASSEY [jifmassey@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:49 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. JENIFER MASSEY
211 AVENIDA VALENCIA
SAN CLEMENTE, CA 92672

Coyle, James

From: Gail Forrest [gailforrest@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:49 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Gail Forrest
1320 Ave de Mesilla #211
1320 Avenida de Mesilla
Las Cruces, NM 88005

Coyle, James

From: Mike Bird [mgb@yosemite.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:49 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mike Bird
5320 Hwy 49 N #5
Mariposa, CA 95338

Coyle, James

From: Cathe Giffuni [cathegiffuni@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Cathe Giffuni
n/a
240 East 27 Street #20K
New York, NY 10016-9258

Coyle, James

From: Pamela Stokes [pam.stokes@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Pamela Stokes
University of Pennsylvania
Locust Street
Philadelphia
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Coyle, James

From: Andrea Yarger [act3@goldenwest.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Andrea Yarger
26914 Battle Mtn Pkwy
26914 Battle Mtn Pkwy
Hot Springs, SD 57747

Coyle, James

From: mary williams [bishwake@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mary williams
1812 S. W. Temple, #226B
1992 S. 200 E., #424B
salt lake, UT 84115

Coyle, James

From: Marian Cruz [marian.cruz2903@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Marian Cruz
661 4th St
661 4th
Hollister, CA 95023

Coyle, James

From: Laurie Hein [ourfelines@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Nuclear/Public H Laurie Hein
Care2
6 Milbark Ct S
Homosassa, FL 34446

Coyle, James

From: Michael Moats [m.moats@3arts.us]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Michael Moats
1100 Maple Ave.
Downers Grove, IL 60515

Coyle, James

From: Maureen O'Neal [momoneal77@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Maureen O'Neal
9100 s.w. 80th ave.
n/a
Portland, OR 97223

Coyle, James

From: Lauren Kinsey [laurenkinsey@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms Lauren Kinsey
n/a
1095 East Dunedin Rd
1095 East Dunedin Road Columbus Ohio
Columbus, OH 43224

Coyle, James

From: Jane Eiseley [jeiseley2@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

n/a Jane Eiseley
n/a
1320 Addison St C432
C432
Berkeley, CT 94702

Coyle, James

From: Carol Simon [simoncm@myfairpoint.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Carol Simon
924 Oak Hill Rd
Swanville, ME 04915

Coyle, James

From: David Pyles [dnpyles@acousticmusic.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. David Pyles
82 Lead Mine Road
82 Lead Mine Road
Nelson, NH 03457

Coyle, James

From: Barbara Capron [bcapron17@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Barbara Capron
58 Hampton Mews
Hampton, NH 03842

Coyle, James

From: Terry Tedesco-Kerrick [ttedesco49@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Terry Tedesco-Kerrick
3042 E Squaw Peak Circle
n/a
Phoenix, AZ 85016-8924

Coyle, James

From: s. t. [sastrotter@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

human s. t.
None, retired teacher
no
none
davis, CA 95616

Coyle, James

From: Maggie Davidson [maggie_davidson@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Maggie Davidson
750 Pine Drive, Apt 11
Pompano Beach, FL 33060-7281

Coyle, James

From: Diane Beeny [beenydiane@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Diane Beeny
Hiroshima/Nagasaki Remembrance Committee
181 Tudor Oval
Westfield, NJ 07090

Coyle, James

From: Brian von Dedenroth [brianvon@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Brian von Dedenroth
509 Valley Vista Dr.
Camarillo, CA 93010

Coyle, James

From: Dency Nelson [dln52@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dency Nelson
2415 Silverstrand Avenue
2415 Silverstrand Avenue
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254-2664

Coyle, James

From: Wayne B. Peters [wbpgreenfield@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Retired Citizen Wayne B. Peters
Sierra Club, Great Waters group
4340 S. 68th St.
4340 S. 68th St.
Greenfield, WI 53220-3428

Coyle, James

From: Susan Puscheck [spuscheck@tds.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Susan Puscheck
8461 Glendale Dr
Ypsilanti, MI 48198

Coyle, James

From: Scott Belanger [onetruewater@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Scott Belanger
29 Beech Street
29 Beech Street
Greenfield, MA 01301

Coyle, James

From: Robert Cherwink [r_cherwink@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Robert Cherwink
528 Joaquin Drive
Sonoma, CA 95476

Coyle, James

From: Kathleen Henry [greenery3@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Kathleen Henry
140 Valley Road
St. Louis, MO 63119

Coyle, James

From: Nayeem Aslam [nayeemaslam@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Nayeem Aslam
135 Elk Trail
429 N Hamilton Ave.,
Carol Stream, IL 60188-9352

Coyle, James

From: Thomas Nelson [twnelson@erols.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Thomas Nelson
Nuclear Information and Resource Service
105 Drexel Ave.
none
Lansdowne, PA 19050-1304

Coyle, James

From: Brian Cummings [bcummings@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Brian Cummings
3959 S. 1st St.
Milwaukee, WI 53207

Coyle, James

From: meg gilman [meggart@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

meg gilman
PO box 584
#2
portsmouth, NH 03802

Coyle, James

From: Steven Handwerker [peacewk@peacewk.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Steven Handwerker
6465 Via Benita
6465 Via Benita
Boca Raton, FL 33433

Coyle, James

From: Ray DiZefalo [raylila120359@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Ray DiZefalo
Human Race
109 LaCosta St.
#508
Melbourne Beach, FL 32951-3479

Coyle, James

From: Jesse Van Gerven [jpvxb6@mail.mizzou.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Jesse Van Gerven
Missourians for Safe Energy
2501 S. Providence Rd. #1305
2501 S. Providence Rd. 31305 Columbia, MO 65203 Columbia, MO 65203

Coyle, James

From: Sue Hanlin [moonbeam@centurytel.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs Sue Hanlin
House wife
P O Box 358
P O Box 358
Amherst, OH 44001

Coyle, James

From: Steven Handwerker [peacewk@peacewk.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Steven Handwerker
6465 Via Benita
6465 Via Benita
Boca Raton, FL 33433

Coyle, James

From: Theresa Viselli [viselli@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Miss Theresa Viselli
54th St.
Savannah, GA 31404-4640

Coyle, James

From: Larry Bulling [larry.bulling@oregonstate.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Larry Bulling
SEIU Local 503
2321 NW Mulkey Ave.
n/a
Corvallis, OR 97330-2429

Coyle, James

From: Marilyn Ortt [marilynortt@suddenlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

This is one more example of short-term profits being given priority.

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Marilyn Ortt
701 Colegate Drive
701 Colegate Dr.
Marietta, OH 45750

Coyle, James

From: Peter Gunther [avengethecathars@juno.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Peter Gunther
2318 W. Sunnyside #3
Chicago, IL 60625

Coyle, James

From: Elisabeth Bechmann [elisabeth.bechmann@kstp.at]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Elisabeth Bechmann
Neugebäudeplatz
Neugebäudeplatz
St. Pölten, ot A 3100

Coyle, James

From: Elizabeth Erpelding-Garratt [egarratt@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Elizabeth Erpelding-Garratt
n/a
10270 Noble Ct
n/a
Indianapolis, IN 46234

Coyle, James

From: Sassy Smallman [gogreen@gwi.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Sassy Smallman
None
1 Florence Circle
1 Florence Circle
Kennebunk, ME 04043

Coyle, James

From: Judi Poulson [judpeace@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:39 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MS Judi Poulson
Fairmont, MN Peace Group
1881 Knollwood Drive
Fairmont, MN 56031

Coyle, James

From: Jennifer Savage [jensav55@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:38 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jennifer Savage
36 E. 69th St.
New York, NY 10021

Coyle, James

From: Catherine Schneider [cschneider13@satx.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Catherine Schneider
none
354 Cresham Drive
none
San Antonio, TX 78218-4219

Coyle, James

From: Richard Miano [mrmiano@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MR Richard Miano
627 Sinclair st.
627 Sinclair st
Reno, NV 89501

Coyle, James

From: Paul Burke - Journey Home [journeyhome@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Paul Burke - Journey Home
5425 Club Head Road
Virginia Beach, VA 23455

Coyle, James

From: Glenda Kohlhafer-Regan [gregan757@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Glenda Kohlhafer-Regan
1420 Jury Rd
1420 Jury Rd
Chesapeake, VA 23322

Coyle, James

From: GILLES MARIN [maringilles@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

GILLES MARIN
2308 PRINCE ST
BERKELEY, CA 94705

Coyle, James

From: Glenn Mitroff [volcoord@wort-fm.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:36 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Glenn Mitroff
1516 Lynchburg Trail
1516 Lynchburg Trail
Madison, WI 53718

Coyle, James

From: DENNIS GADOWSKI [dengad@windstream.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:36 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

DENNIS GADOWSKI
10039 S. R.700 #26
MANTUA, OH 44255-9732

Coyle, James

From: Stephen Gliva [steveillini@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:36 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Stephen Gliva
713 Mulford St
Unit 1A
Evanston, IL 60202

Coyle, James

From: Thomas Paulson [tomwp577@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:36 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Thomas Paulson
none
719 Normandie Drive
not applicable
Norman, OK 73072

Coyle, James

From: Joel Porter [joelypozole@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Joel Porter
1604 SE 38th Ave
PORTLAND, OR 97214

Coyle, James

From: Karen Malley [bonic@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Karen Malley
MoveON.org
1609 s gary st
1609 S. Gary St.
Anaheim, CA 92804-6113

Coyle, James

From: Donald Ward, Jr. [dfward@gw.dec.state.ny.us]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Donald Ward, Jr.
341 Taylor Ct
625 Broadway
Troy, NY 12180

Coyle, James

From: John McPeck [JSMcPeck@NetZero.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:35 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr John McPeck
unorganized; disorganized. No organization
3113 Buccaneer Ct. #001
#001
Fairfax, VA 22031

Coyle, James

From: Melissa Last [chiwawamumzy@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:34 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Melissa Last
321 sesame
321 sesame
Huntersville, NC 28078-1205

Coyle, James

From: Philip Knickerbocker [hvacmetelman@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:33 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Philip Knickerbocker
109 Pyrites Russell Rd.
Russell, NY 13684

Coyle, James

From: Richard Kuszmar [linneamari@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:33 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Richard Kuszmar
11816 Valley Blvd.
11816 Valley Blvd
Warren, MI 48093

Coyle, James

From: Frederick Rogers [ericrogers@plateautel.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:32 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

none Frederick Rogers
retired
P.O. Box 6
212 Blanchard rt.
Serafina, NM 87569

Coyle, James

From: Sabrina Krauss [sabrinak@sonic.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:30 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Sabrina Krauss
619 Wheeler St.
619 Wheeler St.
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Coyle, James

From: Greg Koshak [gregkoshak@centurytel.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:30 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Greg Koshak
Human Being
8709 Cattail Lane
Larsen, WI 54947

Coyle, James

From: marilela bloom [marilela@cals.lib.ar.us]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:29 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms. marilela bloom
5105 copperhead rd.
5105 Copperhead Rd
little rock, AR 72223

Coyle, James

From: Victor Ahern [zenbluesky@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:29 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

scott Victor Ahern
930 Quince Ave
930 Quince Ave
Boulder, CO 80304

Coyle, James

From: Mary Lyda [artisan7@frontiernet.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:29 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Mary Lyda
N-A
P.O.Box 1928
P.O.Box 1928
Cave Junction, OR 97523

Coyle, James

From: Alex Zuaks [alexzukas@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:28 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Alex Zuaks
5615 Spartan Drive
San Diego, CA 92115

Coyle, James

From: Robert Wilson [u_i_1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:28 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Robert Wilson
433 West St. #9
433 West St. # 9 Amherst MA 01002
Amherst, MA 01002

Coyle, James

From: Amy Valens [amylvalens@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:28 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

My husband and I have been concerned about nuclear power regulation for many many years, and our concern only grows. While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs Amy Valens Amy Valens
box 524
209 Montezuma
Forest Knolls, CA 94933

Coyle, James

From: Louise Steele [scottysteele@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:28 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Louise Steele
NC WARN
3316 marblehead lane
3316 Marblehead Lane
Raleigh, NC 27612-4927

Coyle, James

From: Thomas Klein [frthomas@embarqmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:28 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Rev. Thomas Klein
2079 Wayne Rd.
2079 Wayne Rd.
Chambersburg, PA 17202

Coyle, James

From: Ron Ward [ronward36@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:27 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Ron Ward
Whidbey Community eXchange
5268 Honeymoon Bay Rd
5268 Honeymoon Bay Rd, Freeland WA 98249 Freeland, WA 98249

Coyle, James

From: Penelope McMullen [pmsl@cybermesa.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:27 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

I AM A CATHOLIC NUN AND WE CONSIDER THIS TO BE AN URGENT MORAL IMPERATIVE.

Sister Penelope McMullen
Loretto Community
113 Cam. Santiago
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Coyle, James

From: John Wetherhold [zixu@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:27 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr. John Wetherhold
self
13 W. 13th St #4BS
13 w. 13th st.
New York, NY 10011

Coyle, James

From: Tegan Dessenberger [jeanablackwood@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:27 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

The NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications while it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Tegan Dessenberger
Missourians for Safe Energy
111B North Stadium Blvd.
Apt. 75
Columbia, MO 65203

Coyle, James

From: Michele Deradune [deradune@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:26 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Michele Deradune
Individual
126 W. Alpine Rd. #206
126 W. Alpine Rd.
Austin, TX 78704

Coyle, James

From: Michael Schur [mnschur@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:26 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. Michael Schur
Dr
Michael
mnschur@yahoo.com, FL 33461

Coyle, James

From: Lloyd Loring [LWLLoring@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:26 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Lloyd Loring
19025 Oakmont South Dr
19025 Oakmont South Dr
South Bend, IN 46637-3527

Coyle, James

From: Nancy Crompton [nancy.crompton@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:26 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Nancy Crompton
301 South Main
Brattleboro, VT 05301

Coyle, James

From: Ron Rattner [ronrattner@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:26 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Ron Rattner
Retired attorney
1998 Broadway #1204
San Francisco, CA 94109-2206

Coyle, James

From: James Klein [JEKlein64@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:26 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

James Klein
3501 Monterrey St.
Corpus Christi, TX 78411

Coyle, James

From: Eileen Conner [warcon@npacc.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:25 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Eileen Conner
731 Deery Hill Rd.
731 Deery Hill Rd.
Gillett, PA 16925

Coyle, James

From: Satya Vayu [satyavayu@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:25 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Satya Vayu
4418 se harrison st
Portland, OR 97215

Coyle, James

From: Carol McGeehan [cmcgeeha@davenport.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Carol McGeehan
568 West 31st
Holland, MI 49423

Coyle, James

From: terry milligan [terrymac@wildblue.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms terry milligan
PFAW
412 gail lane
gail lane
victoria, TX 77905-0636

Coyle, James

From: Elaine Donovan [donovaneb@frontier.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:24 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Elaine Donovan
9176 Hayward Hill Road
Hemlock, NY 14466

Coyle, James

From: Bill Hamilton [bill@phineasgraphics.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:23 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Bill Hamilton
Phineas
11 Maddy Lane
11 Maddy Lane
Eliot, ME 03903

Coyle, James

From: frances lynch [flynch@thcttechnologies.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:23 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms frances lynch
none
po box 404
po box 404
swampscott, MA 01907

Coyle, James

From: james clemons [ghostly@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:23 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

How many more Fukushima type events do we need before we realize that nuclear energy is not safe nor clean. While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

M james clemons
Sacred Order of The Black Cat
8 south randall road
8; south randall road
aurora, IL 60506

Coyle, James

From: bj novack [bj@kickasswebdesign.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:23 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms bj novack
1021 Washington St
Easton, PA 18042

Coyle, James

From: Victoria Molinari [vmolinari@wildmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:22 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms Victoria Molinari
private citizen
19880 3rd ave nw #35
35
Poulsbo, WA 98370

Coyle, James

From: David Gustafson [gustafson@mchsi.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:22 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr David Gustafson
National Resources Defense Council
3419 50 Street
3419 50 Street
Moline, IL 61265

Coyle, James

From: Drake Chamberlin [drake.chamberlin@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:22 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Drake Chamberlin
POB 4
32 N Franklin ST
Amesville, OH 45711

Coyle, James

From: Kathe Garbrick [femmekatz@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:21 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kathe Garbrick
2944 Keats Ave
Manhattan, KS 66503

Coyle, James

From: Phyllis Oster [poster30@wcnet.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:21 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs Phyllis Oster
Do Not Renew License for Davis-Besse
1719 Juniper Dr.
1719 Juniper Dr.
Bowling Green, OH 43402

Coyle, James

From: Gabriella Turek [gaby@dv8.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:21 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Gabriella Turek
112 N. Michigan Ave #12
Pasadena, CA 91106-1858

Coyle, James

From: Paul Andrade [greenfire999@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:21 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Doctor Paul Andrade
1162 Lakeside Drive
1162 Lakeside Dr
Wimberley, TX 78676

Coyle, James

From: Ruth Mota [ruthmota@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:20 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ruth Mota
595 Summit Road
Watsonville, CA ---

Coyle, James

From: Steve Wilson [safe_drvr@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:20 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Steve Wilson
PO Box 4035
West Richland, WA 99353

Coyle, James

From: Kendra Knight [kcdknight@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:20 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kendra Knight
1657 Molitor Road
Belmont, CA 94002-3715

Coyle, James

From: Joseph Hiatt [hiattjm@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Joseph Hiatt
Sustaining the Public Trust
5415 Connecticut Ave, NW
#735
Washington, FL 20015

Coyle, James

From: Sharon Wright [sharedol@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Sharon Wright
1921 N. Sherry Lane #85
1921 N. Sherry Lane #85
Santa Ana, CA 92705

Coyle, James

From: John Nettleton [jpn5710@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. John Nettleton
4311 SE 37th Ave. #21
na
Portland, OR 97202

Coyle, James

From: Caryn Graves [caryn@lmi.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Caryn Graves
1642 Curtis St.
Berkeley, CA 94702

Coyle, James

From: Jennifer Scott [jjscott9@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jennifer Scott
15930 Bayside Pointe West #703
15930 Bayside Pointe West #703
Fort Myers, FL 33908

Coyle, James

From: William Donald [cny00431@centurytel.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. William Donald
Peaceworks
8 N. Keene St. Apt. A7
Columbia, MO 65201

Coyle, James

From: Sharon Rich [sharonbrich@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Sharon Rich
2834 Regent Crescent
South Daytona, FL 32119-8556

Coyle, James

From: Michael Volen [mvolen@att.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:19 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Michael Volen
106 Sunnyside Ave.
106 sunnyside ave
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Coyle, James

From: Raymond Shaw [rshaw@disciples.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Raymond Shaw
33. E. Albion St.
Holley, NY 14470

Coyle, James

From: Covelo Gibbs [Covelogibbs@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Covelo Gibbs
322 Parkview Road
322 Parkview Road
Whitethorn, CA 95589

Coyle, James

From: Bill Rosenthal [brosent@hunter.cuny.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Bill Rosenthal
2557 Hot Springs Ct.
2557 Hot Springs Ct., Colorado Springs
Colorado Springs, CO 80919

Coyle, James

From: Jennifer Scott [jjscott9@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jennifer Scott
15930 Bayside Pointe West #703
15930 Bayside Pointe West #703
Fort Myers, FL 33908

Coyle, James

From: Lynn Morrow [Lynninpd@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Lynn Morrow
None
70775 Ironwood Drive
70775 Ironwood Drive
Rancho Miraage, CA 92270

Coyle, James

From: Andrea Kuehn [akaalx@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Andrea Kuehn
12723 Bluebell Ave
Hartville, OH 44632

Coyle, James

From: Sally Small [sallyasmall@att.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:18 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Sally Small
389 E Tulane Rd
Columbus, OH 43202

Coyle, James

From: Paige Harrison, R.N. [NamastePJ@Mac.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:17 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Paige Harrison, R.N.
None
215 West 90 Street
#3A
New York, NY 10024-1223

Coyle, James

From: Jon Bleyer [wildwoodpreservation@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:17 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jon Bleyer
50+1 LLC
3926 Wabaska Dr
San Diego, CA 92107

Coyle, James

From: Steve Shuput [sshuput@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:17 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Steve Shuput
690 N Caring Cove
690 N Caring Cove
Salt Lake City, UT 84103

Coyle, James

From: Judy Treichel [judynwtf@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:17 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Exec. Director Judy Treichel
Nevada Nuclear Waste Task Force
4587 Ermine Court
4587 Ermine Court
Las Vegas, NV 89147-5178

Coyle, James

From: Anika cunningham [anikacunningham@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:16 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Anika cunningham Anika cunningham
418 n. Main st.
Bowling Green, OH 43402

Coyle, James

From: Mary Joyce Dixon [vandmjdixon@windstream.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:16 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr. & Mrs. Mary Joyce Dixon
Nuclear Information and Resource Service
6217 Upper Hightower Rd
Hiawassee, GA 30546

Coyle, James

From: Hollis Martin [ethericlight@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:17 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Hollis Martin
246 Creed Hill Rd.
246 Creed Hill
Pittsford, VT 05763

Coyle, James

From: Phil Klein [phil-klein@uiowa.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:16 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Phil Klein
454 Sierra Trl
Coralville, IA 52241

Coyle, James

From: Greg Noneman [krall_lord@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:16 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Greg Noneman
PO BOX 4505
Sherwood, OH 43556

Coyle, James

From: betty winholtz [winholtz@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:15 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

This is unacceptable: the NRC moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation while it drags its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications.

The purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

Yet in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be?

And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

This must stop. Now.

ms betty winholtz
405 acacia
morro bay, CA 93442

Coyle, James

From: Darryl & Diana Boom [diana@dboom.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:15 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Darryl & Diana Boom
PO Box 328
PO Box 328, Lake Oswego OR
Lake Oswego, OR 97034

Coyle, James

From: Darryl & Diana Boom [diana@dboom.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:15 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Darryl & Diana Boom
PO Box 328
PO Box 328, Lake Oswego OR
Lake Oswego, OR 97034

Coyle, James

From: john.cielukowski [skyblu@cfl.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:15 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

john.cielukowski
myself
9 harbor circle
9 harbor circle
cocoa beach, FL 32931

Coyle, James

From: Walker Bennett [vladilyich@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:15 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Where the heck are the NRCs head? Nuclear has absolutely no useful or safe use in the 21st century.

Mr, Walker Bennett
105-26 Gordon St.
Guelph, ON N1H 4G7

Coyle, James

From: Pauline Wittry [pawkk@centurytel.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:15 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Sister Pauline Wittry
none
4614 Townline Rd
4614 Townline Rd
Manitowish Waters, WI 54545

Coyle, James

From: Billy Klock [Wjklock@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:15 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Billy Klock
5763 Haney ct
Watauga, TX 76148

Coyle, James

From: Lance Miller [lmmille@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lance Miller
1143 Bremerton CT NE
Renton, WA 98059

Coyle, James

From: V. Alexander [la_arcoiris_de_verdad@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

V. Alexander
424 Jefferson NE Apt. 27
Albuquerque, NM 87108

Coyle, James

From: Denise Lytle [centauress6@live.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Denise Lytle
73 Poplar St.
Fords, NJ 08863

Coyle, James

From: Tom Wood [tomwould@centurytel.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:14 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Tom Wood
Retired Systems Engineer
1815 Ridgemont
Columbia, MO 65203

Coyle, James

From: Gary Gilardi [gary.gilardi@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Gary Gilardi
1132 8th Street
1132 8th Street
Hood River, OR 97031

Coyle, James

From: Steven & Susan Mayes [bookravens@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Steven & Susan Mayes
16 Mesa Pino
16 Mesa Pino
Santa Fe, NM 87508

Coyle, James

From: Thierry Deshayes [uncleterr@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Thierry Deshayes
Scottsdale Unified #48
Scottsdale, AZ 85251-1418

Coyle, James

From: Erin Harris [erinharris@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Erin Harris
56 Calle Monte Aplanado, NW
Albuquerque, NM 87120-3463

Coyle, James

From: Marcia Hoodwin [marcia@accentsaway.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:13 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

34238 Marcia Hoodwin
Accents Away
8236 Shadow Pine Way
Don't send a receipt; thanks!
Sarasota, FL 34238

Coyle, James

From: Betty Walters [bjw_ena@ionsky.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Betty Walters
4053 Sunshine Canyon
Boulder, CO 80302

Coyle, James

From: gregory andronaco [gregory.andronaco@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:12 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

engineer gregory andronaco
consultant
345 hillview ave
1350 Bon Ave
ukiah, CA 95482

Coyle, James

From: Dai Morello [fastphyl1@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dai Morello
citizen against pork government
984 Harrison Ferry
984 Harrison Ferry
White Pine, TN 37890

Coyle, James

From: Ann Marie Knotek [a.m.knotek@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ann Marie Knotek
3305 Bader Ave.
Cleveland, OH 44109-5464

Coyle, James

From: Douglas Estes [dce005@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Douglas Estes
none
629 Arguello Blvd.
Apt. 303
San Francisco, CA 94118

Coyle, James

From: Esther B Wolf [benlobo@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Esther B Wolf
Wasj. Peace Action
4009 30 Ave. W.
4009 30 Ave. W. Seattle, WA
Seattle, WA 98199

Coyle, James

From: Claude Spiro [crspiro@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:11 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Claude Spiro
567 Somerville Avenue, Apt. #4
crspiro@verizon.net
Somerville, MA 02143

Coyle, James

From: Libbe HaLevy [lhalevy@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Libbe HaLevy
Nuclear Hotseat - weekly podcast
7428 Valaho Dr.
Tujunga, CA 91042

Coyle, James

From: aron shevis [ashevis@nygoexpress.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

aron shevis
302 windsor pl
brooklyn, NY 11218-3249

Coyle, James

From: brian pinkerton [btpink@chibardun.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

Craziness!!!!

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable. We need protection and oversight!!

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr. brian pinkerton
507 w. newton st
507 w. newton
rice lake, WI 54868

Coyle, James

From: Eugene Polissky [epoliss@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Eugene Polissky
50 Old Oak dr
apt 215
Buffalo Grove, IL 60089

Coyle, James

From: Robert Rosas [2ravmn@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications by moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is not acceptable.

In its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels. In reality, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable the use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? Given this language, if the NRC ever did try to shut down a dangerous plant, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Robert Rosas
550 W 22nd Street #4103
Georgetown, TX 78626-8234

Coyle, James

From: Lori Snyder [secretfilly@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:10 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Lori Snyder
962 Centennial Rd.
New Oxford, PA 17350

Coyle, James

From: Deb Brown [deb@oltexts.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Deb Brown
PO Box 98964
Raleigh, NC 27624-8964

Coyle, James

From: Beatrice Clemens [BeatriceBC@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Beatrice Clemens
100 Arundel Place
St. Louis, MO 63105

Coyle, James

From: gretchen small [artem1s1a@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

gretchen small
po box 9554
po box 9554
ketchikan, AK 99901

Coyle, James

From: Scott Abbott [talktoscott dude@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Scott Abbott
22 W. Constance #4
22 W. Constance #4
Santa Barbara, CA 93105-3968

Coyle, James

From: Ginger Cook [minnawee7055@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016 on page 5, the NRC says that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Ginger Cook
none
3933 Kilgore Rd
3933 Kilgore Rd
Goliad, TX 77963

Coyle, James

From: Emma Onawa [emmaonawa@unet.us.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Emma Onawa
29050 Leroy Ave
29050 Leory Ave
Frontenac, MN 55026

Coyle, James

From: Charles McCall [mc1wb@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:09 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Charles McCall
citizen
278 Vine St.
West Bend, WI 53095

Coyle, James

From: richard rushforth [rushforth@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:08 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

richard rushforth
63 Colby Ave
63 Colby Street
Manasquan, NJ 08736

Coyle, James

From: Deanna Nakosteen [deanna@west.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:08 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Deanna Nakosteen
10239 Ojai-Santa Paula Road
Ojai, CA 93023

Coyle, James

From: Kate Skolnick [krs1123@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:08 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kate Skolnick
640 Carroll St., Apt. B4
Brooklyn, NY 11215

Coyle, James

From: Darlene St. Martin [stmartin79@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:08 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Darlene St. Martin
NA
506 N Laventure Road
NA
Mount Vernon, WA 98273

Coyle, James

From: Chena Mesling [c_1mesling@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:08 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Chena Mesling
2330 SE Taylor St
Portland, OR 97214

Coyle, James

From: Bradley Gordon [beardedrainbow@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Bradley Gordon
PO Box 113
PO Box 113
Sebastopol, CA 95473

Coyle, James

From: Darlene Jakusz [jdjakusz@wi-net.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Darlene Jakusz
8380 Ambrose Lane
Amherst Jct., WI 54407

Coyle, James

From: Linda Howe [lhowe@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet in implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

In fact, however, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the interests of the public. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Linda Howe
66 Selwyn Rd.
Belmont, MA 02478

Coyle, James

From: Chris Jenkins [jeep7.cj@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Chris Jenkins
3305 Bader Ave.
Cleveland, OH 44109-5464

Coyle, James

From: Wayne Gibb [wdgibb@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:07 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Wayne Gibb
8690 Trenton Road
8690 Trenton Road
Forestville, CA 95436

Coyle, James

From: Al Abrams [alanabrams@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:06 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Al Abrams
826 Beech Avenue
Findlay, OH 45840

Coyle, James

From: Jeff Deal [deal99@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:06 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jeff Deal
247 Old Bristol Road
220 Tall Timber Trail
Boone, NC 28607

Coyle, James

From: Nancy Brenner [nancybrenner@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:05 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs Nancy Brenner
37258 Huckaby Lane
37258 Huckaby Lane
Murrieta, CA 92562-3258

Coyle, James

From: Bev Huntsberger [bev@phlogiston-inc.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:05 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms Bev Huntsberger
3030 El Nido Dr
Altadena, CA 91001

Coyle, James

From: Jean Puchstein [puch2_1999@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:05 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jean Puchstein
505 Dominion BLVD.
1733 Athens Court
Columbus, OH 43214

Coyle, James

From: Joel Trupin [ktrupin@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Joel Trupin
retired
3704 Woodmont Blvd.
Nashville, TN 37215-1840

Coyle, James

From: Lori Schreier [schreierlori@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lori Schreier
916 River Road
916 River Road Westmoreland NH
Westmoreland, NH 03467

Coyle, James

From: Cinny Poppen [goldenpop60@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Cinny Poppen
Appalachian Peace Education Center
114 ElderSpirit Court
114 ElderSpirit Court
Abingdon, VA 24210

Coyle, James

From: Lisa Young [lisagreenyoung@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lisa Young
1601 N. 16th St. Apt. A
Boise, ID 83702

Coyle, James

From: Julie Pizzo [jpizzo@redshift.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

Prioritize physical health and safety of living beings.

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Julie Pizzo
PO Box 2134
PO Box 2134
Monterey, CA 93940

Coyle, James

From: Shannon Rudolph [shannonkona@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Shannon Rudolph
shannonkona@gmail.com
P. O. 243
P.O. 243
Holualoa, HI 96725

Coyle, James

From: Margery Coffey [margerycoffey@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Margery Coffey
none
205 Farley Ave.
none
Rosalie, NE 68055

Coyle, James

From: Bob Brister [bbrister@q.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:04 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Bob Brister
1102 S 800 E #A
Salt Lake City, UT 84105-1206

Coyle, James

From: Barbara Grosh [barbara@grosh.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr Barbara Grosh
12 Whittlers Ridge
Pittsford, NY 14534-4522

Coyle, James

From: Edwin Aiken [eandjaiken@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

I am a former US Navy nuclear submarine engineering officer.

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Edwin Aiken
NASA (Retired)
663 Torrington Dr
Sunnyvale, CA 94087-2445

Coyle, James

From: Roger Brown [justicefilez@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Roger Brown
KRUD - Keep Radiation Under Discussion
7590 Bately Ct.
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Coyle, James

From: Lisa Hammermeister [necrohead56@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Lisa Hammermeister
16456 Shamhart Dr.
Granada Hills, CA 91344

Coyle, James

From: Larry Lambeth [llamrtment@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

The NRC needs to implement much needed post-Fukushima safety modifications. The NRC also needs to stop efforts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels. This seems to be an attempt to add something new that is unacceptable. The stated purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Larry Lambeth
municipal
2635 W. Alta
Springfield, MO 65810

Coyle, James

From: David Anderson [dandersop51@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr. David Anderson
2735 Benvenue Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94705

Coyle, James

From: darius mitchell [dariusmitchell@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:03 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr. darius mitchell
2727 w manor pl #202
2727 w manor pl
Seattle, WA 98199

Coyle, James

From: Pat moore [jpmoore@carolina.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Citizens before corporations. Safety before profit.

Mrs. Pat moore
URI
1571 queens rd w
Charlotte, NC 28207

Coyle, James

From: Rich Garant [rgarant2007@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

no to "enabling" Rich Garant
Sagealliance
25 Chestnut Hill #1
25 chestnut hill #1
Brattleboro, VT 05301

Coyle, James

From: Mostyn Thayer [mostynthayer@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mostyn Thayer
2372 SE Grand Drive
2372 SE Grand Drive
Port St. Lucie, FL 34952

Coyle, James

From: Arun Toke [arun@skippingstones.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Arun Toke
Skipping Stones
P O Box 3939
PO Box 3939
Eugene, OR 97403

Coyle, James

From: Paul Engstrom [paulmaryengstrom@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Paul Engstrom
SEIU - RETIRED
655 Washington St.
Los Altos, CA 94022

Coyle, James

From: Karen Kirschling [kumasong@excite.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Karen Kirschling
633 Oak Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

Coyle, James

From: Jerry Penderegast [j-penderegast@northwestern.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Let's keep the NRC's mission the same as it has been.

Mr. Jerry Penderegast
Athletes United For Peace
5436 N Spaulding
5436 N Spaulding Chicago
Chicago, IL 60625

Coyle, James

From: Joseph Buhowsky [jbuhowsky@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:02 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Joseph Buhowsky
IBEW 595
83 Tahoe Court
San Ramon, CA 94582-4865

Coyle, James

From: Ben Ruwe [benruwe@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ben Ruwe
412 Glengarry Rd.
Felton, CA 95018

Coyle, James

From: Tibor Weinreb [tw9123@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Tibor Weinreb
NIRS
1041 e 83 st
Brooklyn, NY 11236-4225

Coyle, James

From: Andrea Chavez [achavez86@clear.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Andrea Chavez
6807 Neston
San Antonio, TX 78239

Coyle, James

From: Mona Locke [monalocke@att.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Mona Locke
None
PO Box 131
Middletown, CA 95461

Coyle, James

From: Daniel Woods [Dan190270@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Daniel Woods
10742 S. Komensky Ave.
Oak Lawn, IL 60453

Coyle, James

From: Patricia Rosenthal [johnpatr@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Patricia Rosenthal
Sierra Club
1717 S. Prairie Avenue #1310
#1310
Chicago, IL 60616

Coyle, James

From: Gary Blanchard [SLANDER@austin.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:00 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Gary Blanchard
7805 Wheel Rim Circle
Austin, TX 78749

Coyle, James

From: Geoff Briggs [jandidesign@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:00 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Geoff Briggs
I & I Design
8404 31st Ave NE
8404 31st Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

Coyle, James

From: Kaiba White [kaibawhite@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:00 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kaiba White
1307 Barton Hills Dr Apt 8
Austin, TX 78704

Coyle, James

From: GARRY WEISMAN [garryweisman@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 4:00 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr GARRY WEISMAN
4403 SILVERWOOD
Houston, TX 77035-3635

Coyle, James

From: Kathleen Myers [ardenvoir3@aim.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kathleen Myers

Asheville, NC 28803

Coyle, James

From: D Ponte [davidponte@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. D Ponte
4400 Solano Park Cr.
1633
Davis, CA 95616

Coyle, James

From: Callie Riley [callie_riley@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Callie Riley
8054 Oak Avenue
Citrus Heights, CA 95610-2514

Coyle, James

From: Les Lambert [eaglewind1@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Les Lambert
37 Lansing Ave
Worcester, MA 01605-1023

Coyle, James

From: Patricia Rhoda [drhoda@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Patricia Rhoda
432 N. Patrick Rd
432 N. Patrick Rd
Stockton, CA 95215-1550

Coyle, James

From: Dan Mack [danw.mack@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dan Mack
706 1st ave north
512
Minneapolis, MN 55403

Coyle, James

From: Mary Green [greengreen108@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Mary Green
code pink/Taos
PO Box 1779
520 Conrad Lane
Taos, NM 87571

Coyle, James

From: Tina Desmarais [Tinadesmarais@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Tina Desmarais
Citizen of the USA
Gray Rd
gray rd
Plainfield, VT 05667

Coyle, James

From: D Wontor [GalleyInd@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

D Wontor
1437 Hemlock Farms
Lords Valley, PA 18428

Coyle, James

From: Sharon Fortunak [srf7120@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:58 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Sharon Fortunak
7120 Ivystone Ave So
Cottage Grove, MN 55016-1909

Coyle, James

From: Kate Paradis [paradaly@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kate Paradis
2295 Glenwood Dr.
Boulder, CO 80304-2334

Coyle, James

From: Greg Schwartz [greg.m.schwartz@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Greg Schwartz
2239 Cromwell Circle #408
Austin, TX 78741

Coyle, James

From: SUSAN CLARK [GEORGNBAY@AOL.COM]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mrs SUSAN CLARK
CBG
13400RIVERSIDE DRIVE
13400 riverside drive
SHERMAN OAKS, CA 91423

Coyle, James

From: Rebecca tippens [rebecca_tippens@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Rebecca tippens
Center for cultural evolution
68 Van Nuys Rd
68 Van Nuys rd
Colrain, MA 01340

Coyle, James

From: Rebecca tippens [rebecca_tippens@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Rebecca tippens
Center for cultural evolution
68 Van Nuys Rd
68 Van Nuys rd
Colrain, MA 01340

Coyle, James

From: Marguerite King [valdetara@mhccable.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Marguerite King
Nuclear Information and Resource Service 3480 Schoharie Turnpike 3480 Schoharie Turnpike Earlton, NY
12058

Coyle, James

From: Karl Moore [mthead432@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Karl Moore
None
35547 Garden Dr
None
Slidell, LA 70460

Coyle, James

From: Bruce Donnell [b_donnell@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:57 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Bruce Donnell
104 Avenida de las Casas
Santa Fe, NM 87506

Coyle, James

From: Patience Robbins [robbinsp@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Patience Robbins
4505 31st St.
Mount Rainier, MD 20712

Coyle, James

From: Carol Savary [carol@carolsavary.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Carol Savary
PO Box 2990
Kings Beach, CA 96143

Coyle, James

From: Kelly Lynn Anderson [kellylynnanderson@ymail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Kelly Lynn Anderson
po box 464
po box 992
sebastopol, CA 95473

Coyle, James

From: Kathy Dolan [lee_quan_2000@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kathy Dolan
702 W. Thomas Rd.
702 W. Thomas Rd.
Wheaton, IL 60187

Coyle, James

From: Nancy Wrenn [ncwrenn@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Nancy Wrenn
WILPF
8 Maple Street
8 Maple Street
Auburndale, MA 02466-2405

Coyle, James

From: Laura M. Ohanian [lmo@efn.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Laura M. Ohanian
P.O. Box 811
Eugene, OR 97440

Coyle, James

From: Kathy Seal [kathyseal@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kathy Seal
2431 32nd St.
2431 32nd st
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Coyle, James

From: gail hartman [hartman@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

gail hartman
ponderosa court
louisville, CO 80027

Coyle, James

From: Michelle Macy [mmacyartist@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Michelle Macy
12550 Piping Rock, #8
Houston, TX 77077-5847

Coyle, James

From: Deborah Rubin [mamarubin@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Deborah Rubin

Citizens for a Sustainable Governmental Policy 19160 Dove Creek Drive
19160 Dove Creek Drive Tampa, FL 33647

Coyle, James

From: Johanna Kovitz [joko@pangolyn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Johanna Kovitz
12 Farrington Ave Apt 4
Allston, MA 02134

Coyle, James

From: cara busch [cara_busch@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. cara busch
740 little rock creek rd
740 little rock creek rd
cherry log, GA 30522

Coyle, James

From: Lois White [loey11@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lois White
486 Tunnel Creek Road
Grants Pass, OR 97526-9748

Coyle, James

From: Jessie Rosenthal [thereddolly@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:56 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jessie Rosenthal
55 south lake ave. apt. b4
albany, NY 12203

Coyle, James

From: Joan Jenness [cerridwen@roadrunner.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Joan Jenness
24 Chickadee lane
Bridgton, ME 04009

Coyle, James

From: Kellie Smith [kelf.nh@live.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kellie Smith
13 Brandy Lane
Deering, NH 03244-6500

Coyle, James

From: John Moszyk [Johnmoszyk48@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. John Moszyk
Individual
4278 Bordeaux
4278 Bordeaux
St Louis, MO 63129

Coyle, James

From: javier rivera [javierocker@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr. javier rivera
55 south 3rd st.
brooklyn, NY 11211

Coyle, James

From: Janet Searles [jansearles@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs Janet Searles
Pend Oreille Co Democrats
271 Fries Ln
271 Fries Lane
Newport, WA 99156

Coyle, James

From: Jack Miller [jmiller1018@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Which will you put first- public safety or corporate profits?

Jack Miller
130 Delong Road
130 delong Road
Middleburg, PA 17842

Coyle, James

From: EM schleifer [maxesther@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

EM schleifer
personal
123 Perkins St
Jamaica Plain, MA 02458

Coyle, James

From: margaret copi [tango.lindygirl@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

margaret copi
3426 Adell Ct
oakland, CA 94602

Coyle, James

From: MATTHEW BESSELL, LCSW [Woofwow@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. MATTHEW BESSELL, LCSW
P.O.Box 242
110 Harding Court
Centerport, NY 11721

Coyle, James

From: Vesna Glavina [vglavina@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:55 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Vesna Glavina
1703 Kosola Ave., Apt A2
1703-A2 Kosola Ave., Fairfield, IA 52556 Beachwood, IA 52556

Coyle, James

From: Benjamin Phillips [bphillips@sc.org.ni]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Benjamin Phillips
4 Ashburton Place
Cambridge, MA 02139

Coyle, James

From: Peggy Jayne [peggyjaynehawaii@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Peggy Jayne
1057 Makawao Ave
Makawao, HI 96768

Coyle, James

From: Joel Kay [jjkof1@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dr Joel Kay
10707 SE Stanley Ave
none
Milwaukie, OR 97222-4362

Coyle, James

From: James Fering [jfering@charter.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

James Fering
2914 Green View Dr
Eau Claire, WI 54703-0623

Coyle, James

From: E.S. SCHLOSS [ESS.007@RCN.COM]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

E.S. SCHLOSS
155 E. 93RD ST., #4A
155 E. 93RD ST., #4A
NY, NY 10128-3768

Coyle, James

From: Karen Bearden [chickadeebirders@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Safety comes first!

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Karen Bearden
1809 Lakepark Drive
Raleigh, NC 27612-6516

Coyle, James

From: Jean Erlbaum [jean.erlbaum@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jean Erlbaum
56 Orchard St.
true
Greenfield, MA 01301

Coyle, James

From: David Osterhoudt [dostermail@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

David Osterhoudt
21022 Los Alisos Blvd., Apt. 214
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688-3246

Coyle, James

From: valerie gilbert [confer-96842@mypacks.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

valerie gilbert
345 east 56th street #10E
new york, NY 10022

Coyle, James

From: Nicole Lucchesi [lvx1313@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Concerned World Nicole Lucchesi
Terraism.net
4612 Fair Ave
4612 Fair Ave
Oakland, CA 94619

Coyle, James

From: Lori Kegler [lgk9732@lausd.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lori Kegler
810 W. 27th St.

San Pedro, CA 90731

Coyle, James

From: Irene Radke [irenelillian@juno.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:53 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Irene Radke
4648 SW 38th Terr
Dania Beach, FL 33312

Coyle, James

From: William Palmisano [palm1953@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:52 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. William Palmisano
Open Alternative School
1578 Las Canoas Rd.
1578 Las Canoas Rd.
Santa Barbara, CA 93105-2343

Coyle, James

From: V Stark [vstark@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:52 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

V Stark
PO Box 391644
Mountain View, CA 94039

Coyle, James

From: Dennis Trembly [trembly@usc.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:52 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dennis Trembly
880 West 1st Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012 Los Angeles, CA 90012-2417

Coyle, James

From: Peter Scott [anarchoskn69@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:52 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Peter Scott
7040 E 400 S
Knox, IN 46534

Coyle, James

From: Chris Ackman [cackman@berkeley.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Chris Ackman
2395 Piedmont
Berkeley, CA 94704

Coyle, James

From: John Barkhausen [jsb@madriver.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:52 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. John Barkhausen
72 Lois Lane
72 Lois Lane
Warren, VT 05674

Coyle, James

From: melba Dlugonski [melbajade@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. melba Dlugonski
none
6735 SE 78th
6735 SE 78th
Portland, OR 97206-7116

Coyle, James

From: Lise Stoessel [lisebsbss@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lise Stoessel
335 Glade Lane
Charlottesville, VA 22901

Coyle, James

From: Sean Quinlan [squinlan@alumni.princeton.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Sean Quinlan
12205 269th Way NE
Duvall, WA 98019-8219

Coyle, James

From: Merlene Stuerzer-Rhodes [cacmerlene@windstream.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Merlene Stuerzer-Rhodes
22806 E. 131 St. So.
Broken Arrow, OK 74014

Coyle, James

From: Donelle Benson [dbenson@hmbg.utah.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Donelle Benson
1954 E Evergreen Ave
1954 Evergreen
SLC, UT 84106

Coyle, James

From: A.L. Hern [originalthinkr@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

A.L. Hern
1545 N. Hobart Blvd., #332
#332
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Coyle, James

From: ingrid erickson [kashmirdream@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:51 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms. ingrid erickson
1104 e. maryland
1104 E Maryland St Apt 1
bellingham, WA 98226

Coyle, James

From: Rachel Stahlke [ras1515@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:50 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

That is as ridiculous as Katie Couric and her remark about the EPA being there to protect people from the environment.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Rachel Stahlke
7224 W. Hinsdale Dr.
Littleton, CO 80128

Coyle, James

From: tom shepherd [tomshepherd2001@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:50 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

tom shepherd
11319 S. Langley Ave.
Chicago, IL 60628

Coyle, James

From: Douglas McNeill [doug.mcneill@wap.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:50 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Douglas McNeill
PeterCares House
33T Ridge Rd
Unit T
Greenbelt, MD 20770-0718

Coyle, James

From: Janet Wolf-Eshe [jgreenhouse@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:50 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Janet Wolf-Eshe
Self
1412 4th St
3940 NW Elizabeth Place
Sacramento, CA 95814

Coyle, James

From: Elizabeth Croom [slizcroom@lorettomotherhouse.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:50 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Elizabeth Croom
515 Nerinx Road
511 Nerinx Road
Nerinx, KY 40049

Coyle, James

From: Peter Maniscalco [peteronlongisland@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:50 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Peter Maniscalco
Renew Community Earth
52 Ava Court
Manorville, NY 11949

Coyle, James

From: Amber Tidwell [etoile90230@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:50 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Amber Tidwell
2420 1/2 N. Beachwood Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90068-3005

Coyle, James

From: Harry Hochheiser [hshoch@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:49 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Harry Hochheiser
5742 Woodmont St
Pittsburgh, PA 15217

Coyle, James

From: Sindona Cassteel [sindona@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:49 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Sindona Cassteel
68-1776 Niu Haohao PI
68-1776 Niu Haohao PI
Waikoloa, HI 96738

Coyle, James

From: Arifa Goodman [goodkaz@newmexico.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:49 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms Arifa Goodman
PO Box 303
San Cristobal, NM 87564

Coyle, James

From: chloe cerutti [ccerutti1@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:49 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. chloe cerutti
2841 Vicwood Dr.
2841 Vicwood Dr., Murfreesboro, TN 37128 Murfreesboro, TN 37128

Coyle, James

From: Gay Chung [gcchung@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:49 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Gay Chung
1517 Waller
425 28th St.
San Francisco, CA 94117-2836

Coyle, James

From: Elise Edwards [islandgirl33956@embarqmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Elise Edwards
5050 Island Acres Court
5050 Island Acres Court
St. James City, FL 33956

Coyle, James

From: LuMarion Conklin [conklinlu@npgcable.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

LuMarion Conklin LuMarion Conklin
3114 Loma Vista Dr.
3114 Loma Vista Dr.
Flagstaff, AZ, AZ 86004-3919

Coyle, James

From: Janice Forsberg [jan.forsberg@mac.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Janice Forsberg
1793 Rome Ave.
1793 Rome Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55116

Coyle, James

From: marita mayer [maritaann@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. marita mayer
12 Austin Ave.
12 ustin Ave.
San Anselmo, CA 94960

Coyle, James

From: Dai Morello [fastphyl1@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft. STOP PROTECTING THE NUCLEAR INDUSTRY. PROTECT US CITIZENS.

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Dai Morello
citizen against pork government
984 Harrison Ferry
984 Harrison Ferry
White Pine, TN 37890

Coyle, James

From: Rob Lee [ebob4@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Rob Lee
Shore Drive
Shore Drive
Grapeview, WA 98546

Coyle, James

From: Fred Fargotstein [f.fargotstein@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Fred Fargotstein
1717 El Paso St
Pittsburgh, PA 15206

Coyle, James

From: Francis Braunlich [february@snet.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Francis Braunlich
8 Paramount Ave.
Hamden, CT 06517

Coyle, James

From: mike turner [letouch@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mike turner
3051 w. 39th. ave.
denver, CO 80211

Coyle, James

From: John Feissel [johnfeissel@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

John Feissel
2216 Memphis St.
Philadelphia, PA 19125

Coyle, James

From: William Collins [happyheretic@q.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. William Collins
n/a
PO Box 57292
PO Box 57292
Tucson, AZ 85732

Coyle, James

From: Chiari Legare [clubharriet@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Chiari Legare
12 mulberry st, apt 1
claremont
claremont, NH 03743

Coyle, James

From: Danna Williams [dlwillia@uga.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Danna Williams
131 Helican Springs Rd.
Athens, GA 30601

Coyle, James

From: Beverly Janowitz-Price [bevjano@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Beverly Janowitz-Price
3020 N. 14th Street
phoenix, AZ 85014-5621

Coyle, James

From: Megan Roemer [sistermeg@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Megan Roemer
2602 6th St.
Boulder, CO 80304

Coyle, James

From: Ellen Garduno [ellen.garduno@symetra.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs Ellen Garduno
Human Race
20224 83rd Ave W
20224 83rd Ave W
Edmonds, WA 98026

Coyle, James

From: Gretel Munroe [zgmunroe@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable. The NRC does not have the good of the public in mind.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now. This is one of the most important issues of our time.

Ms. Gretel Munroe
Grassroots Actions for Peace
9 Leyden Ave.
Medford, MA 02155-6634

Coyle, James

From: Takana Gottschalk [takanagottschalk@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Takana Gottschalk
2725 Grell Lane
2725 Grell Lane
Oceano, CA 93445

Coyle, James

From: Frank Sabatini [fpsabatini@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:48 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Frank Sabatini
119 ASTER CT
EXETER, PA 18643

Coyle, James

From: Rudolph E. Radau Jr. [skip.radau@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Rudolph E. Radau Jr.
1025 E. Alta Vista St.
1025 E. Alta Vista St.
Tucson, AZ 85719-3004

Coyle, James

From: Nick Salerno [nick_salerno@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Nick Salerno
18165 Casey Rd.
Grayslake, IL 60030

Coyle, James

From: Rich Moser [rich@transcendentalastrology.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr Rich Moser
1645 Miramesa Dr
1645 Miramesa Dr
Santa Barbara, CA 93109

Coyle, James

From: Lorenz Steininger [schreibdemstein@posteo.de]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lorenz Steininger
Waldstr
Hohenwart, VA 22554

Coyle, James

From: Joan Miller [jmiller2525@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Joan Miller
41 Calder Court
Marlboro, NJ 07746

Coyle, James

From: helen mcgrail [exkabex@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:47 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

miss helen mcgrail
EARTHLING
72 bogota st
72 BOGOTA ST, STATEN ISLAND, NY 10314-6226 staten island, NY 10314

Coyle, James

From: Lawrence Crowley [magic@ecentral.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lawrence Crowley
441 Pheasant Run
Louisville, CO 80027

Coyle, James

From: Joan W. Drake [joanwdrake@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Joan W. Drake, M Joan W. Drake
gray panthers
2532 Q St, NW
Washington, DC, DC 20007

Coyle, James

From: Jody Weisenfeld [jodweis@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Jody Weisenfeld
318 Bond Ave
Ptalluma CA
Petaluma, CA 94954

Coyle, James

From: Barbara Wood [barbara@dobsis.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Barbara Wood
1926 SE Richmond Lane
1926 SE Richmond Lane
Port Orchard, WA 98367

Coyle, James

From: Joanne Wagner [jlwagner@wisc.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Joanne Wagner
4601 Windigo Trail
Madison, WI 53711

Coyle, James

From: Alexandra Gordon [alixg1@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Alexandra Gordon
11701 S.W. 80 Rd.
Miami, FL 33156

Coyle, James

From: Stuart Weiss [stuartweiss3@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:46 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Stuart Weiss
1280 Albion St. #36
Denver, CO 80220

Coyle, James

From: Harold Hodes [hth3@cornell.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Harold Hodes
102 Homestead Terrace
Ithaca, NY 14850-6218

Coyle, James

From: Carol Collins [ccollins54@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Carol Collins
1935 Nault Road
Dover, DE 19904

Coyle, James

From: Michael Kiralla [michaelkiralla@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Michael Kiralla
411 E. Huntington Drive, # 107-233
411 E. Huntington Dr., #107-233, Arcadia, CA 91006 Arcadia, CA 91006

Coyle, James

From: Tom Wenzel [tomwenzel@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Tom Wenzel
2063 Meadowbrook rd.
Prescott, AZ 86303

Coyle, James

From: Kevin Rolfe [kevin@rolfes.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Kevin Rolfe
14006 N Green Hills Loop
Austin, TX 78737

Coyle, James

From: Larry Siegel [lrrysgl@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Larry Siegel
2113 Fox Run Drive
2113 Fox Run Drive
Plainsboro, NJ 08536

Coyle, James

From: dale rieht [dale@dalerieht.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

dale rieht
86 south park st
86 south park st
san francisco, CA 94107

Coyle, James

From: Donald Walsh [djw411@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:45 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Donald Walsh
323 buchanan St
323 Buchanan St
Alexandria, VA 22314

Coyle, James

From: Christopher Cable [opegasus@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Christopher Cable
4350 Inclination Way
Missoula, MT 59803

Coyle, James

From: Rush Rehm [mrehm@stanford.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Rush Rehm
Stanford University
835 Lakeview Way
551 Serra Mall
Redwood City, CA 94062

Coyle, James

From: Laura Neiman [lneiman55@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Laura Neiman
60 Seaman Ave 5G
60 Seaman Ave Apt. 5G
New York, NY 10034-2821

Coyle, James

From: William Smith [bilbosmith@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr William Smith
515 Ford st
515 Ford St
West Conshohocken, PA 19428

Coyle, James

From: Terry Huey [terry.huey@uky.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Terry Huey
P.O. Box 22253
P.O. Box 22253 Lexington, Ky
Lexington, KY 40522-2253

Coyle, James

From: Linda Ferland [lindae1946@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Linda Ferland
35 Pearl St
60 N. Laurel St.
Claremont, NH 03743

Coyle, James

From: David Stetler [davidhstetler@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:44 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. David Stetler
NIRS
203 Dorn Ave
Apt. C
Everett, WA 98208-2646

Coyle, James

From: Helen Manning-Brown [helenmb@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms. Helen Manning-Brown
3640 Walnut Ave.
3640 Walnut Avenue
LONG BEACH, CA 90807-4310

Coyle, James

From: Lynne Preston [bluelynne@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lynne Preston
638 Rhode Island St.
San Francisco, CA 94107

Coyle, James

From: darynne jessler [darynnej@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

darynne jessler
4408 gentry ave
NA
valley village, CA 91607

Coyle, James

From: Kay Warren [kwarren98532@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now. Take us seriously. If you don't we will have to find those who will. I am not a child.

Ms Kay Warren
POB 1124
Centralia, WA 98531

Coyle, James

From: James Doeppers [jimdoeppers@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

James Doeppers
259 Richardson Dr
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Coyle, James

From: Russell Bates [russbumper@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Russell Bates
2437 Piedmont #202
#202
Berkeley, CA 94704

Coyle, James

From: monroe jeffrey [ita@operamail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

monroe jeffrey
International Tribal Association
323 E 5th St
Perris, CA 92570-2403

Coyle, James

From: Elizabeth Dodd [libbydodd@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Rev. Elizabeth Dodd
18678 Cape Sable Drive
Boca Raton, FL 33498-6374

Coyle, James

From: Carl Howard [littgrey@ix.netcom.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Carl Howard
1807 N 4th St, Apt 1
Apt 1
Columbus, OH 43201

Coyle, James

From: Susan Peterson [petersonbestway@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Ms Susan Peterson
private citizen
101 EdL Lane
101 EdL Lane
Ridgeway, WI 53582

Coyle, James

From: Frank Kolwicz [kolwicz@minetfiber.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Frank Kolwicz
311 Cherry Lane, S.
n/a
Monmouth, OR 97361

Coyle, James

From: James H Jorgensen [onejorgy@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr James H Jorgensen
Individual
4207 Westbrook Drive
Ames, IA 50014

Coyle, James

From: B. Thomas Diener [texasbtdiener@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:43 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

B. Thomas Diener
405 Zena Lona St. NE, Unit E
405 Zena Lona Street NE, Unit E
Albuquerque, NM 87123-3089

Coyle, James

From: Lorene Rowland [queenpuck@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Lorene Rowland
939 14th St
939 14th St W
Billingssss, MT 59102

Coyle, James

From: Robert Groff [rw_groff@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Robert Groff
225 Michelle Drive
Campbell, CA 95008-1719

Coyle, James

From: Robert Clark [bclark@iserv.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Robert Clark
1153 W Glenlord Rd Lot 68
1153 W Glenlord Rd Lot 68
Saint Joseph, MI 49085

Coyle, James

From: MichaelEric Lerner [michael_k_lerner@pobox.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

MichaelEric Lerner
1671 Marina Way
San Jose, CA 95125-5524

Coyle, James

From: Andrew Kurzweil [ackurz@optonline.net]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Andrew Kurzweil
P.O. Box 290601
Brooklyn, NY 11229

Coyle, James

From: john satterfield [jhnsttrfdjh@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

mr john satterfield
jes company
198 eastwood blvd
198 eastwood blvd
centereach, NY 11720

Coyle, James

From: Kay Hawkle [khawkle@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Vice President, Kay Hawkle
Tallahassee Area Community
3313 Wedgwood St
1739 Fremont County Rd 21A
Midland, TX 79707

Coyle, James

From: Gordon Gerbitz [gforce1@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr Gordon Gerbitz
N/A
535 E Yanonali Street
535 E Yanonali St
Santa Barbara, CA 93103

Coyle, James

From: veronica hayes [veronicalhayes@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

veronica hayes
242 w. chesterfield
242 W. Chesterfield
Ferndale, MI 48220-2428

Coyle, James

From: David Gerke [dggerke@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

David Gerke
11 Pine St.
White Oaks, NM 88301

Coyle, James

From: B. Lerner [bklerner@pobox.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. B. Lerner
1671 Marina Way
1671 Marina Way
San Jose, CA 95125-5524

Coyle, James

From: John Crotty [jmcrotty1467@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

John Crotty
1467 Cherry Creek
Manchester, MO 63021-6923

Coyle, James

From: Cathy Wootan [cwootan@wsem.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Cathy Wootan
3862 W. 20th St.
Cleveland, OH 44109

Coyle, James

From: Ronald Withrow [ronw1@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Ronald Withrow
The People
1273 Wilbur Ct. NE
Palm Bay
Palm Bay, FL 32905-4322

Coyle, James

From: Stephen Zerefos [sgz@bshn-architects.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Stephen Zerefos
1770 Beechwood St. NE
Warren, OH 44483

Coyle, James

From: adam osbekoff [adam@snoqualmiation.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

adam osbekoff
Aleutian Sun
9416 384th
snoqualmie, WA 98065

Coyle, James

From: Linda McBurney [linda@lindabacon.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mrs. Linda McBurney
Democrat all my life
65 Upper Toyon Drive
65 Upper Toyon Drive
Kentfield, CA 94904

Coyle, James

From: Rena Lewis [relew@roadrunner.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Rena Lewis
1202 Loma Dr
Ojai, CA 93023

Coyle, James

From: Yasiu Kruszynski [kruszynski.j@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Yasiu Kruszynski
Anarchist Federation, Workers Initiative 1100 W Addison St Chicago, IL 60613-0011

Coyle, James

From: nanette wizov [nanowiz@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:41 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

ms nanette wizov
109 wesley ave
26 Spruce Avenue
Collingswood, NJ 08108

Coyle, James

From: Erik Schnabel [erikschnabel@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Erik Schnabel
229 Dore St.
San Francisco, CA 94103

Coyle, James

From: Jean Naples [jnaples@jhsph.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:40 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Doctor Jean Naples
Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health
9 Benson Street
9 Benson Street, West Haverstraw, New York West Haverstraw, NY 10993-1302

Coyle, James

From: Michael Mariotte [nirsnet@nirs.org]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 3:37 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.

Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.

Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.

This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.

Mr. Michael Mariotte
NIRS
6930 Carroll Avenue #340
Brentwood, MD 20722