

Coyle, James

From: Janice Foss [libraj@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 5:59 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

10/4/2011
76 FR 61402 (6)

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

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

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

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

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations 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 Foss
2435 Colusa St.
Pinole, CA 94564

RECEIVED

NOV 11 2011 5:15 PM

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGISTRATION DIVISION

SONSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

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

Coyle, James

From: Kit Blumenstein [misskittex@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 08, 2011 11:35 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 Kit Blumenstein
966 Camden Dr
966 Camden Dr
Lewisville, TX 75067

Coyle, James

From: anthony messina [surfone@optonline.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 08, 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.

anthony messina
1 springview court
1 Spring Springview Court
east patchogue, NY 11772

Coyle, James

From: Eric Morris [ewmorr@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, November 07, 2011 3:23 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. Eric Morris
na
1167 S Washington
na
Nashville, IL 62263

Coyle, James

From: Jane Hope [jane.hope73@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, November 07, 2011 1:50 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.

ms. Jane Hope
FOR
1413 Christy Ave.
Louisville, KY 40204

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

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

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

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

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

For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations 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

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 [nanlc999@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: Yvonne Hodgkins [huckleberry_hollow@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 06, 2011 12:01 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft
Categories: Strategic Plan

What civilization implements an energy strategy, using a highly-dangerous life-threatening source of fuel, without first determining how the spent fuel will be safely handled and what might be the consequences of a meltdown or the effect of an earthquake on a nuclear power plant. Surprise! The answer is.... our civilization!

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

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

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

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

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

Yvonne Hodgkins Yvonne Hodgkins
24091
423 Huckleberry Road NW
423 Huckleberry Road NW
Floyd, VA 24091

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 [fletchercossa@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 [daisy1376@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: Jim Phillips [rechog@earthlink.net]
Sent: Saturday, November 05, 2011 12:54 PM
To: Coyle, James
Subject: Comment on NUREG-1614, Vol. 5, draft

Categories: Strategic Plan

Do not allow the NRC to regulate itself. There must be an independent organization, team to regulate and verify its findings. If finding indicate safety and health issues, the offending company must make repairs. If repairs cannot be done, shut the nuclear plant, power unit down immediately.

No more nuclear power plants should ever be built again. Regards to DU (depleted uranium), it should be deposited of correctly and with care. DU must not be used again and must not be made into weapons.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Jim Phillips
33 Mazatlan Dr.
Sonoma, CA 95476

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: Twila Stofer [Twilastofer@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 01, 2011 7:39 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.

Public Health & Twila Stofer
none
60 Benton Way
none
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405