

## Rulemaking1CEm Resource

---

**From:** RulemakingComments Resource  
**Sent:** Monday, October 21, 2013 12:49 PM  
**To:** Rulemaking1CEm Resource  
**Subject:** FW: Public Waste Confidence from marni magda

**DOCKETED BY USNRC—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
SECY-067**

**PR#:** PR-51

**FRN#:** 78FR56775

**NRC DOCKET#:** NRC-2012-0246

**SECY DOCKET DATE:** 10/17/13

**TITLE:** Waste Confidence—Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel

**COMMENT#:** 00053

**From:** Marni Magda [mailto:marnimagda@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 17, 2013 8:43 PM  
**To:** Michalak, Paul; Marni Magda; RulemakingComments Resource  
**Subject:** Public Waste Confidence from marni magda

SONGS Nuclear Waste Disposal Questions for NRC after Public Hearing in Carlsbad on September 24, 2013

For: Paul Michalak NRC [paul.michalak@NRC.gov](mailto:paul.michalak@NRC.gov) Comments for Waste Confidence Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Rule

Submitted by Marni Magda

460 Oak Street  
Laguna Beach, CA 92651  
949 494 1373  
[marnimagda@gmail.com](mailto:marnimagda@gmail.com)

How can the NRC expect a generic environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Rule to apply to all of the 104 reactors in the United States? You are wasting the taxpayers' money with such an approach. The nuclear reactor sites all have different concerns and must be dealt with as a unique impact with rules that fit each site.

SONGS must have attention paid immediately to its vulnerable spent fuel. The two years to create a PSDAR is too long to get in motion the kind of actions that are necessary to save Southern California from calamity and must begin today, not in two years.

Southern California Edison has lied to the public about safety problems at SONGS of which the company was well aware. They knew the steam generators were a faulty design before they were installed. They have in a constant record that is public information now of failures to adhere to safety regulations. The company puts profit before safety. With this terrible record, they must not be given oversight of the Decommissioning of SONGS. There is a history that would show the \$4 billion dollars set aside to decommission SONGS would not be used for immediate, final solutions. There is profit for Edison in keeping the spent fuel on site.

Since a US Military Base is in jeopardy if anything goes wrong with the spent fuel sitting at SONGS, and it is on military land, can the execution of the removal of the spent fuel be placed in the capable hands of someone from the military, protecting the future of Camp Pendleton Marine Base?

When for two years Elmo Collins, who was then the administrative director of NRC Region IV, met with the public at NRC hearings and told us that SONGS was safe, he listed each of the possible disasters and said behind it, "adequate protection." He was referring to the nuclear fuel within the reactor domes. With the shutdown of SONGS, the public has learned that the 1631 tons of spent fuel on site is not held to that standard of safety. The spent fuel cooling pools are outside the reactor domes. They were not created for long term storage and are not required to have "defense-in-depth" nuclear safety features. SCE has the worst safety record of all nuclear energy companies in the United States. They are going to continue to falsely tell the public that safety is their first concern. We are playing with our future every day the spent fuel sits at SONGS.

What exactly are the current safety standards for the spent fuel cooling pools at SONGS?

What exactly are the current safety standards for the 42 dry storage casks?

What back up is required today to protect the spent fuel pools from an electrical shut down of more than four hours? How many hours without cooling are the spent fuel pools safe? How far away are the back-up generators? Are they sufficient to keep all cooling pools safe for the three days of 90 mile an hour winds that our Santa Ana winds that hit Southern California each year might continue, keeping air support from the cooling pools if firestorm over ran the facility where the spent fuel pools are kept? What safety precautions exist for that circumstance?

What is the safety formula for protecting the spent fuel from all disaster possibilities? Firestorm, earthquake, tsunami or terrorists? Such as the reactor domes were "adequate" against a 7.0 earthquake, and five terrorists on the ground.

We were led to believe that nuclear spent fuel must wait five to seven years to be put in dry storage. No new fuel has been generated at SONGS for two years, so conceivably in five years all spent fuel at Songs could be in dry storage. Why have only 42 dry storage casks been created in the 30 years the spent fuel has been accumulating at SONGS?

Since the shutdown, the public has learned that 16 years ago a dangerous high burn fuel began to be used at SONGS. Who approved of that change? This kind of fuel is considered by the rest of the world too dangerous to use. What environmental impact did this higher burn fuel create have on the ocean? What temperatures changed or volume of ocean water used and dispersed? Who approved of this change of fuel at SONGS? What studies were demanded?

Have we stored any of this more deadly spent fuel in dry storage at SONGS in the last 16 years? How? In what kind of storage? Where? Have we moved any of this more deadly high burn spent fuel from the SONGS spent fuel cooling pools? How? Where?

How much of the spent fuel in cooling pools at SONGS is not high burn fuel? Is it stored in separate cooling pools from the high burn more dangerous fuel? Since this fuel is older than 16 years, could it all be in dry storage? Is all of it in dry storage?

How long must the high burn fuel at SONGS remain in cooling pools before it can be stored in dry storage? How long will those dry storage casks last? How long must we wait to put the high burn fuel in final geologic disposal transportable casks? How soon could it be moved to MRS monitored, retrievable storage and how do we begin to get a California solution for MRS high burn fuel? We need it YESTERDAY. It can't wait, 2 years, let alone 20 to 60.

SONGS can't keep the spent fuel where it is because of earthquake or tsunami possibilities that could create a Fukushima meltdown here any day. How can spent fuel in cooling pools be moved from Songs to a geological location that would be safe to store the fuel in new cooling pools that are away from earthquake faults, the ocean, and 8.4 million people? This must be done!!!!

Has MOX been moved from SONGS that wasn't in dry storage casks? How? When? Where?

There is a vast difference in the type of the dry storage casks being used around the country for storing nuclear spent fuel.

According to the Blue Ribbon Committee's report to the President in January of 2012, the US Navy has 50 final geologic disposal, transportable casks for its movement of nuclear waste out of Idaho by 2035. It will have 350 more before that date.

How long does it take to make these casks? What do they cost? Is there any reason we can't use them at SONGS? Final disposal and transportable - that must be our goal. SCE profit in storing nuclear spent fuel on site at SONGS cannot be allowed to make us pretend that spent fuel should stay at SONGS for years. It shouldn't be there for even days.

The Friends of the Earth report by Alvarez said the casks SCE is considering will be a million dollars each. Who determines the certification of the number of years a cask is safe? Many in the country currently are said to be certified at 30 to 40 years. What makes a ten year difference? What do we do after the thirty or 40 years are up? Who sets the value of a cask, another corporation like SCE who values profit over public safety?

We need final geologic disposal casks that are transportable. Is that the NRC recommendation? We can't leave our grandchildren with the Chernobyl type mess of no money and containment needing to be redone every thirty or so years. When the four billion dollars projected to be spent decommissioning SONGS is spent, does that include final disposal of all spent fuel created at SONGS, even that which lasts 24,000 years?

What dates did the current 42 casks for dry storage get fuel placed in them?  
These casks were constructed somewhere near SONGS.  
What is their certification for length of safe storage?  
Are these dry storage casks considered transportable?

In Sept 2014, SCE wants to lower safety standards by using the NUHOMS 32PTH2 dry cask system. This requires crowding 32 fuel assemblies into the same size cask that currently holds 24. Who makes the approval of such a change? Edison always chooses profit over safety. Who will decide? What safety consideration would allow that change?

The NRC reminded us that Fukushima dry storage casks survived the tsunami in 2011. What kind of dry storage casks were these? How far away from the reactors that were damaged and are still out of control today were these casks stored?

Since 1998 the US has been delinquent in supplying a location for final disposal of nuclear spent fuel that the federal government promised when nuclear reactors were being built in the late 1960's. There is currently no place being prepared to take the US nuclear spent fuel. When President Obama shut down Yucca Mountain after nearly 30 years of preparing the site to be a final geologic deposit for all of our nuclear waste for the entire country, America became a deadly accident waiting to happen at 104 reactors. But SONGS sits with everyday a potential to destroy as in Fukushima the land from Oceanside to Laguna Beach, shut down forever. The nuclear reactors built in the 1960's were never built to store the waste on site. No state is willing to accept the nuclear waste. The NRC is now wrongly requiring that the waste is safest being stored on site. These old plants were not designed for that. What other plan is possible?

Since 1998, the taxpayer has been paying billions of dollars to the Nuclear Energy companies like SCE to store nuclear waste on site until a place can be found to dispose of it. This fine goes on as long as the spent fuel is stored on site. How much money has SCE been paid by the Federal government since 1998 for the spent fuel it has stored at SONGS? How was that money used?

How much money will SCE get each year even with the plant shut down for leaving the spent fuel at SONGS? Is there any law forcing SCE to spend the money from this fine for moving the spent fuel into transportable casks? Must the money be used for something related to storage of spent nuclear fuel or does it just go into the SCE or for that matter the International Edison general fund?

SONGS would never have been approved for construction by the NRC with today's understanding of the dangers and the realization that the Federal Government has failed to remove the nuclear spent fuel to a safe location. In the 1960's we believed a way to use the spent fuel would be invented. It hasn't. MOX is unstable and not accepted for commercial use. California is an earthquake zone, with SONGS on a new fault, and we have yearly danger of out of control wild fires and global warming predicting rising ocean levels. Maps have been made. How far is the ocean at SONGS predicted to rise in the next 30 years?

A new study has shown an Alaska tsunami could destroy the ocean areas of Newport Beach, Laguna Beach and San Clemente. We cannot afford to let the spent fuel stay at Songs for 30 years until the Cesium 137 has lost its power. That is only 45% of the spent fuel. What about the other 55%? Plutonium has a 24,000 year half-life. What is being done to protect 8.4 million people from a cooling pool accident?

We cannot wait for a Federal solution for all of the 104 US reactors' spent fuel storage. California must come up with its own solution. We must create a place away from populations, away from aquifers, away from earthquake zones to store California nuclear spent fuel from SONGS and DIABLO. The law that would create this solution must include prohibition of any other spent fuel to be stored there and a law against any new reactors ever being built in this earthquake fault state so obviously vulnerable to nuclear accident. We have Fukushima from which to learn. A desert military base away from population centers and earthquake faults in California could be a solution. What must be done to create that solution?

Meanwhile we are playing Russian roulette with the future of California by storing our spent fuel with a company that has a dismal safety record and will continue to profit from leaving the spent fuel in the pools where it now is. We need an immediate MRS solution—Monitored Retrievable Storage. Is there any interim

step that could get the spent fuel pools moved from the ocean and at least 50 miles away from 8.4 million people, monitored and protected by our US military?

Who on the NRC is willing to help create this complex but necessary solution before the third largest economy in the world, the state of California, gets compromised forever?

**Hearing Identifier:** Secy\_RuleMaking\_comments\_Public  
**Email Number:** 62

**Mail Envelope Properties** (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0011FCB4F352C)

**Subject:** FW: Public Waste Confidence from marni magda  
**Sent Date:** 10/21/2013 12:48:52 PM  
**Received Date:** 10/21/2013 12:48:53 PM  
**From:** RulemakingComments Resource

**Created By:** RulemakingComments.Resource@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**  
"Rulemaking1CEM Resource" <Rulemaking1CEM.Resource@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	13330	10/21/2013 12:48:53 PM

**Options**  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Return Notification:** No  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Sensitivity:** Normal  
**Expiration Date:**  
**Recipients Received:**