

## Rulemaking1CEm Resource

---

**From:** RulemakingComments Resource  
**Sent:** Monday, November 04, 2013 11:59 AM  
**To:** Rulemaking1CEm Resource  
**Subject:** FW: nuclear waste & dry cask storage.....

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

**PR#:** PR-51

**FRN#:** 78FR56775

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

**SECY DOCKET DATE:** 11/01/13

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

**COMMENT#:** 00117

---

**From:** Houston, Ann E [[mailto:betsy\\_houston@med.unc.edu](mailto:betsy_houston@med.unc.edu)]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 01, 2013 8:39 PM  
**To:** RulemakingComments Resource  
**Subject:** nuclear waste & dry cask storage.....

To whom it may concern -

I guess better-late-than-never, but what a sad commentary on the responsibility that the NRC feels for its mission. Obviously nuclear waste has been one of the defining problems with nuclear energy technology since its beginning, but in my opinion the attitude that "we'll just deal with that later" seems to have been the approach for decades. Now the issue has been forced, I guess in part by the looming potential of global catastrophe from reactor 4 at Fukushima. How much of this extraordinary threat could have been prevented if Japan (TEPCO) had been required to spend the extra money for what I understand to be much safer but more expensive **dry cask storage** - not to mention all the other places around the globe put at equal risk because of the same short-sighted "frugality"? It seems to me that the threat "Your money or your life!" has never been more accurate.

I feel that the NRC has a moral obligation to put all other concerns aside & show global responsibility & leadership, based on what I hope their mission is: to regulate the use of nuclear power in order to require that the safest methods are used in all aspects of the technology - period. I hope their mission is not to do this by the cheapest means possible.

Fukushima's reactor 4 has me very, very much on edge, where I will stay until the problem is resolved, one way or the other. I simply do not understand how any one industry is allowed to gamble with the health of the entire planet; it seems inconceivable. How do we explain that to our children?

Is it possible that the NRC could finally insist that the potential for the very same catastrophe be removed from the United States by requiring dry cask storage, at the very least?

Most sincerely,  
AEHouston  
North Carolina

**Hearing Identifier:** Secy\_RuleMaking\_comments\_Public  
**Email Number:** 129

**Mail Envelope Properties** (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D00127B216D0AC)

**Subject:** FW: nuclear waste & dry cask storage.....  
**Sent Date:** 11/4/2013 11:59:20 AM  
**Received Date:** 11/4/2013 11:59:22 AM  
**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	2260	11/4/2013 11:59:22 AM

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