

Comment# 243

77 FR 65137

10/25/2012

As of: December 17, 2012
Received: December 13, 2012
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. Ijw-82ip-9bpr
Comments Due: January 02, 2013
Submission Type: Web

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

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-0370

Comment on FR Doc # 2012-26295

Submitter Information

Name: Sandra Cobb

Address:

3880 Ellendale Road
Moreland Hills, OH, 44022

RECEIVED

2013 JAN - 8 PM 3:02

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
USNRC

General Comment

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on its Nuclear Waste Confidence Decision and Rule is legally deficient. It does not clearly describe the proposed federal action, nor the preferred alternative(s). Due to those fatal legal flaws, the Federal Register Notice must be withdrawn, corrected, and re-issued. In the meantime, this proceeding must be suspended by NRC, and the allotted time for public comments must be re-started from the beginning.

NRC should stop rushing this environmental impact statement process. Just last year, NRC staff estimated it would take 7 years to do a quality job on an EIS. But now, NRC is rushing the entire process in just 2 years. NRC should extend comment deadlines, and hold public comment periods in every atomic reactor community, to do a comprehensive, high quality EIS.

I oppose the Temporary Storage of spent Fuel after Cessation of Reactor Operation for these reasons:

Atomic reactors should not be generating high-level radioactive waste.

What is the preferred alternative of the agency not approving any more new reactor combined Construction and Operating License Applications (COLA)?

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