

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: January 08, 2013
Received: January 02, 2013
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 1jx-82vz-ism3
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-0509

Comment on FR Doc # 2012-26295

166

10/25/2012

77 FR 65137

Submitter Information

Name: Laura Sorensen

Address:

40 Green Valley Rd
Asheville, NC, 28806

Submitter's Representative: Chairperson

Organization: SAFE Carolinas

RECEIVED

2013 JAN - 8 AM 10: 12

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
USNRC

General Comment

See attached file(s) for SAFE Carolinas 2 pages.
please verify they are received.....Lsredoak@gmail.com

Attachments

NRC Waste Confidence Scoping comments

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

SAFE Carolinas
Safe Alternatives for Future Energy

40 Green Valley Rd Asheville, NC 28806
828-665-3668 Lsredoak@gmail.com

Chairman Allison Macfarlane
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

January 2, 2013

RE: Docket No NRC-2012-0246
Environmental Impact Statement Scoping for Waste Confidence Rule 10 CFR 51.23

Dear Chairman Macfarlane:

On behalf of SAFE Carolinas, a nonprofit organization with members in North Carolina and South Carolina, I submit the following comments concerning radioactive waste storage at nuclear power plant sites. This document supplements my personal oral comments made to the commission on December 6, 2012.

During the scoping hearing on December 6th, we were informed by the NRC of plans to hold an EIS hearing at various locations across the U.S. The NRC asked for feedback on what locations would be best. As stated orally, SAFE Carolinas believes that all nuclear plant sites deserve an EIS hearing on nuclear waste and that there should be no new nuclear power plants built.

We also want to express our emphasis on communities facing possible NEW CONSTRUCTION of a nuclear power plant. For example, citizens should be able to question NRC staff and make public comments on the nuclear waste produced in their town at the proposed W.S. LEE Nuclear Station near Gaffney, S.C. Issues to be addressed include monitoring issues, storage type and exact location, possible health effects, trucking, and strict guidelines for the time period they are required to store the radioactive waste. Nuclear utility ratepayers must be made aware of the dollar amount they pay for nuclear waste management.

The NRC must be transparent in their efforts to give notice to the citizens of Gaffney, SC and surrounding 100 mile radius about the *current* hazards of storing nuclear waste at *existing* reactor sites. People living in this area must be fully informed that they will be faced with storing nuclear waste for generations to come because there are no current plans for permanent waste disposal. Why? There are no citizens who feel safe having thousands of metric tons of radioactive waste dumped in their state.

Because the nuclear fuel cycle is incomplete, we assert the continuation of nuclear power as an energy source is irresponsible. Therefore, the safer replacement alternatives of renewable energy must be represented clearly. NEPA (40CFR - 1502.12) states the agency must "rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives" when considering an energy source.

An alternative is reasonable when it provides safety and avoids environmental harm. This has NOT been the case in the current EIS for the WS LEE Nuclear Station proposed by Duke Energy. No investigative figures to support their dismissal of solar as an alternative to nuclear were shown.

A public comment by Dan Gamble during the EIS hearing concerning solar energy as an alternative at this site needs to be re-examined by the NRC. (Public Comment March 6, 2012 tracking #80fd04c4) Also, Duke Energy must be required to provide proof of a detailed site analysis on solar and wind energy production at the proposed nuclear plant site.

In summary, SAFE Carolinas:

- does not support the continuation of nuclear power plants due to the unresolved spent fuel issue since the beginning of the nuclear industry.
- recommends EIS hearings at all nuclear power plants in the US, but especially those undergoing
- or facing a proposed new nuclear plant construction in their community.
- requests alternative solutions be included in the EIS with renewable energy options that include detailed analysis with actual facts and figures to support their claims.
- the EIS should include a realistic timeline for waste storage including how much waste we have now, how much waste EACH plant will produce in its lifetime, how much waste is allowed at a federal repository, and strict guidelines and enforcement concerning the waste capacity at each nuclear plant. In other words when a nuclear plant is forced to over stock spent fuel, it needs to be shut down. This requires different limits at each reactor site.
- an analysis should be submitted concerning the spent nuclear fuel storage sites already in existence, their current inventory and allowable storage capacity.
- the public has the right to know transportation details. The EIS should include a map showing nuclear power plants and their spent fuel storage destination across the US.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Sorensen, Chairperson
SAFE Carolinas
40 Green Valley Rd.
Asheville, NC 28806