

From: [Shannon Rudolph](#)
Subject: Docket ID No. NRC-2012-0246 Re: Waste
Date: Tuesday, September 17, 2013 5:21:59 PM

Aloha!

I completely agree with Ace Hoffman's email, below.

Thank you,
Shannon Rudolph
P. O. 243 Holualoa, Hi. 996725

Docket ID No. NRC-2012-0246 Re: Waste (No-)Confidence meetings

September 17th, 2013

To Whom It May Concern, NRC:

During the protocol portion of the Waste (No-)Confidence proceedings, which are scheduled to start October 1st, I (and others) repeat asked for the ability to view, and participate in all the hearings which are to be held nationally. Webcast, phone-in, webinar -- all have been denied.

So at the last Waste (No-)Confidence protocol phone-in earlier this week, instead of asking yet again for one of these things, I commented instead on the SCOPE of the Waste (No-)Confidence decisions being considered. That comment was also denied but in a different way: I was told it would be a good comment to submit during the Waste (No-)Confidence comment period, which began the next day.

I therefore am submitting those comments, as suggested. As it turns out, I had thought to record the comment with my smartphone at the last moment, so I can submit it not only word-for-word, but inflection-for-inflection by submitting it as an audio recording.

But inflection also only carries part of the meaning. There's still nothing to see. That is why NRC is required to meet in the same room with the ratepayers, advocates, concerned citizens, and other interested parties and stakeholders in their decisions. That is why the NRC is required to come out to the local communities.

Visual accompaniment -- either of the speaker or of the speaker's presentations (slides, videos, etc.) -- is another important part of communication. Therefore I took the recording of the comments I made at the Waste (No-)Confidence protocol phone-in, which I was told should be submitted during the comment period, and added visual aids to further explain what I'm talking about.

That video has been uploaded to You-Tube and is available here:

<http://youtu.be/P6zqHtGZ-N4>

The audio is uncut and unedited, and runs under two minutes.

I would like this video to be played at the opening hearing to be held October 1st, 2013 at the central NRC headquarters in Maryland. Additionally, if possible, it would be very convenient if my time to speak is scheduled fairly accurately for that hearing, because the California Public Utilities

Commission is holding a hearing locally (in San Diego, 30 miles from my home) the same day, about decommissioning San Onofre. I would like to speak at both hearings if I can arrange it, since the topics are tightly intertwined. I will probably end up listening to and watching the Waste (No-)Confidence proceedings with earbuds on my smartphone while physically at the other hearing, paying as close attention to it as possible with my other ear.

If my 4G connection fails so I am unable to speak, at least the video could be played. If I have a live connection, as I expect to have, then I hope I could also add a minute or two of additional commentary such as responding to the NRC staffer's additional comment that I should take a look at page 4-79 of the recently-published Waste Confidence document, which I have since done, and which was not enlightening in any way.

This brings me to the second topic of this letter: Why can't the Nuclear Regulatory Commission set up some form of Internet bi-directional connection for EACH of the dozen Waste (No-)Confidence meetings around the nation? Of course you don't want to be loaded up with the same people "preaching to the choir" over and over again -- but there are ways to avoid that. So why not transmit the audio and video and have a live audio/video chat line or at least a typed questions column? It's something that literally tens of thousands of other organizations (and you too, probably) do every day. So why not for these vitally-important, judicially-mandated proceedings?

After all, this is 2013. NRC needs to get real about the technological challenges it faces regarding nuclear waste. NRC should also get real about the technological marvels that are available in the real world to help them follow their mandates: To protect the world from radioactive accidents (best done by switching to solar power), to properly inform the public of their regulatory decisions, and to allow the public to take part in formulating our national nuclear policies.

Those policies have been irrational for too long. Not allowing ALL of the public to witness and be a part of ALL of these historic "65-years-of-failure" Waste (No-) Confidence proceedings is a criminal act of denial-of-service.

Even to drive 50 miles round trip these days can be a significant expense for a struggling household. A nuclear accident can easily affect 100s of miles around. Roughly 80% of the population of the United States lives that close to a nuclear power plant, nuclear infrastructure (such as a fuel fabrication facility) or transportation route for nuclear waste. NRC's "Waste (No-)Confidence" decisions affect everybody. Everybody should have a right and an opportunity to participate. In fact, the hearings -- sorry, meetings -- should allow people to speak for far more than the usual three minutes if they need to. I would like to also submit the following video, called "THE PHYSICS OF SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL" which we made from a live Internet chat I did a couple of months ago:

<http://youtu.be/xfVx-UysJ0I>

It's a 31 1/2 minute video, but if there's a more appropriate kickoff to explain to interested parties what the issues are regarding "Waste (No-)Confidence" I haven't seen it, which is why we made it.

The team that created these videos (myself and my buddies) would be happy to go to EACH of the NRC's "Waste (No-)Confidence" meetings and ensure that some form of live transmission occurs. We would also record the meetings in HD. We could live-broadcast all the proceedings for the NRC -- unforeseeable technological hurdles notwithstanding (unlike nuclear power operators, we are realists). For financial reasons of course, it would be impractical for us to do so without compensation for travel, time and expenses, but the public would undoubtedly appreciate the

money being spent so they could see and even participate in the proceedings live as they occur. NRC should already know the public wants this, based on the many comments requesting Internet access that were made during the protocol phone-ins.

I'm sure, however, if NRC was willing to pay for it, they could ensure that each hearing is broadcast on their own, without our help. Most universities these days can do it from any classroom, for instance. I'm sure NRC could do it too, if they tried.

In the meantime, please let me know about the other matters discussed in this letter.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Ace Hoffman
Carlsbad, CA

--
How wonderful it is that nobody need wait a single moment before starting to improve the world. ~ Anne Frank