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

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: November 14, 2012 Received: November 13, 2012

Status: Pending Post

Tracking No. 1jw-81ym-19hm Comments Due: January 02, 2013

Submission Type: Web

Docket: NRC-2012-0246

Name: Kai Mikkel Forlie

Address:

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

10/25/2012 77 FR 65137

Document: NRC-2012-0246-DRAFT-0072 Comment on FR Doc # 2012-26295

ame: Kai Mikkel Forlie ddress: 27 Germain Street	Submitter Information	RECEIVI	2012 NOV 1 4 PM	RULES AND DIRECT BRANCH USNRC
Burlington, VT, 05401			ہب	



General Comment

I am writing to comment on the rule as proposed. In my opinion, any rule which permits the storage of high level nuclear waste at, or nearby, or adjacent to two existing nuclear power plants. and/or at plants currently in the midst of the decommissioning process overlooks the undeniable fact that there is currently no facility on Earth (nor any plans to construct any in North America) currently in operation that is designed for the long term storage of high level nuclear waste. And since we have no permanent storage facility, the obvious question arises: "Why are we producing the most toxic substance on Earth without any idea about what we're going to do with it?" Moreover, since there is no proven method for the permanent storing of this substance, and since this substance is deathly toxic for 100,000 years, and since the some of the oldest human structures on Earth are only a few thousand years old, what kind of hubris does it take to even suppose that we can safely store this substance forever? This rule as proposed points out the insanity evident in our dialogue on this topic. When are the people who are supposed to be looking out for our well being and the well being of the planet going to admit for once and for all that it is wrong to continue supporting the nuclear power industry, particularly in creating nonsense rules that permit and encourage the continued creation of the most deadly substance ever unleashed. Wake up! The rule as proposed is but another band-aid and I, for one, am disgusted that this band-aid approach is allowed to continue. Nuclear power and nuclear waste have the potential to terminate life on Earth as we know it. Yet we waste precious time debating the finer points of storing this substance above ground. What madness this is! We need to immediately stop all production of nuclear waste and devise a method to deal with the hell we have unleashed. I do not support this rule.