

## WCRM-GEIS1CEm Resource

---

**From:** Sierra Club [information@sierraclub.org] on behalf of Amanda Porter [grannymannie75@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 22, 2013 11:27 PM  
**To:** RulemakingComments Resource  
**Subject:** Protect our communities from radioactive waste!

Sep 22, 2013

Allison McFarlane

Dear McFarlane,

I am writing you because I am concerned about how we store our most hazardous waste, the radioactive fuel rods from nuclear reactors. We should not license or re-license any reactor until it has been proven that we can successfully isolate this waste. However, one attempted solution, depleted uranium in weaponry, is so dangerous to its victims (sometimes the innocent "collateral damage") that it should be outlawed as chemical weapons are, especially since our own troops occasionally are affected. Radiation is dangerous to human health, as the citizens of Japan are discovering since the tsunami (and, of course, from the bombings of their cities in World War II). A recent book illustrates the almost fatal accidents that have occurred in the industry--not revealed to the public who might recognize the hazard that this form of energy produces and decide that renewable, clean, nonpolluting, and safe for us and our planet solar, wind, etc. is the better way to go!--ultimately cheaper too.

While we are working on the solution, I am also concerned that many of our nuclear reactors have over-crowded fuel pools on site. These present safety threats to the communities and industries that surround the plants. The NRC should take immediate action to reduce the number of fuel assemblies in the water-filled pools. Before transferring the fuel rods to cask storage, the cask storage needs to be examined and reinforced to be able to safely store the fuel rods particularly those that qualify as high burn up fuel. Hardened on-site storage of the casks should become the choice for storage, since transporting radiation waste could create mobile Chernobyls.

I am also concerned about the sustainability of nuclear power. The EIS needs to evaluate the true costs of nuclear power after the subsidies are stripped away. The long-term costs of decommissioning need to be considered as well. The ongoing costs to US taxpayers should be transparent in this EIS.

Finally, the EIS should consider the option of not making any nuclear waste at all in the future by comparing the environmental footprint of nuclear from mining to long term waste disposal to that of renewables and energy efficiency. Humans may be too prone to make mistakes for this level of technology.

Sincerely,

Amanda Porter  
2 Stratton St N  
Piscataway, NJ 08854-3661  
(732) 675-2443

**Federal Register Notice:** 78FR56775  
**Comment Number:** 1957

**Mail Envelope Properties** (23881176.1379906827992.JavaMail.www)

**Subject:** Protect our communities from radioactive waste!  
**Sent Date:** 9/22/2013 11:27:07 PM  
**Received Date:** 9/22/2013 11:27:25 PM  
**From:** Sierra Club

**Created By:** information@sierraclub.org

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

**Post Office:** app230

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2440	9/22/2013 11:27:25 PM

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