

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: November 14, 2012
Received: November 11, 2012
Status: Pending Post
Tracking No. 1jw-81x5-x8mv
Comments Due: January 02, 2013
Submission Type: Web

Docket: NRC-2012-0246

Consideration on Environmental Impacts on Temporary Storage of Spent Fuel After Cessation of Reactor Operation

Comment On: NRC-2012-0246-0001

Consideration of Environmental Impacts of Temporary Storage of Spent Fuel After Cessation of Reactor Operation

Document: NRC-2012-0246-DRAFT-0059

Comment on FR Doc # 2012-26295

10/25/2012
77 FR 65137

61

Submitter Information

Name: Michael W Evans

Address:

3731 S Sepulveda Blvd
Apt 1
Los Angeles, CA, 90034-6888

RECEIVED

2012 NOV 14 PM 2:58

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
USNRC

General Comment

For decades, Riverkeeper and other organizations have had no confidence in assertions by the nuclear industry and various regulatory agencies about nuclear waste—now a federal court has agreed. It is imperative that we use this opportunity to halt the industry push for a quick and dirty solution and inject some sanity into the debate on nuclear energy and radioactive waste. Here are some guidelines for commenting on the scope of environmental review:

1. Don't Rush It.

The NRC is rushing the process, and expects to issue a draft EIS for public comment sometime in 2013. Producing a legitimate Waste Confidence Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) should take seven years.

2. Be Thorough

The NRC must resolve many technical issues including long-term waste integrity, vulnerability and deterioration; the potential for accidents; and lessons learned from Japan's devastating 2011 Fukushima Daiichi meltdown.

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM - 013
E-RIDS= ADM -03
Add= S. Lopas (SLL2)

