

WCRM-GEIS1CEm Resource

From: Sierra Club [information@sierraclub.org] on behalf of Jane Cone [jazan2@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:02 AM
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: ONE THOUSAND YEAR HALF-LIFE?

Sep 24, 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.

What in the name of Heaven were people thinking? Brilliant idea--nuclear energy, but its hazardous-waste byproduct has a half-life of more than a thousand years??!! AND NO SAFE METHOD for destroying the spent fuel rods??? Ever heard of Fukushima?? Germany is making solar power work--and you don't know why, so I'll tell you:

The German GOVERNMENT has decided to support solar power 100%. And that's all it takes. A government with people who USE THEIR HEADS.

Amazing concept, isn't it? The German government IS NOT controlled by oil companies or power companies? Another amazing concept. Smart, responsible people with smart ideas. Wish we could have that here in the "greatest country on earth," soon to be added to the "third world country" list.

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.

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.

Sincerely,

Jane Cone
909 8th Ave SW
Ruskin, FL 33570-4515

Federal Register Notice: 78FR56775
Comment Number: 19613

Mail Envelope Properties (20831447.1379998897296.JavaMail.www)

Subject: ONE THOUSAND YEAR HALF-LIFE?
Sent Date: 9/24/2013 1:01:37 AM
Received Date: 9/24/2013 2:27:40 AM
From: Sierra Club

Created By: information@sierraclub.org

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

Post Office: app230

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2501	9/24/2013 2:27:40 AM

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