Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject: Attachments: RulemakingComments Resource Friday, December 20, 2013 12:22 PM Rulemaking1CEm Resource RulemakingComments Resource PR-51 Waste Confidence 1066 taylor.pdf

DOCKETED BY USNRC—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY SECY-067

PR#: PR-51 FRN#: 78FR56775 NRC DOCKET#: NRC-2012-0246 SECY DOCKET DATE: 12/18/13 TITLE: Waste Confidence—Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel COMMENT#: 00569

Hearing Identifier:	Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number:	593

Mail Envelope Properties (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0014433C49B0B)

Subject:	PR-51 Waste Confidence	
Sent Date:	12/20/2013 12:21:45 PM	
Received Date:	12/20/2013 12:21:44 PM	
From:	RulemakingComments Resource	

Created By: RulemakingComments.Resource@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"RulemakingComments Resource" <RulemakingComments.Resource@nrc.gov> Tracking Status: None "Rulemaking1CEm Resource" <Rulemaking1CEm.Resource@nrc.gov> Tracking Status: None

Post Office:	HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov	
Files MESSAGE 1066 taylor.pdf	Size 254 79344	Date & Time 12/20/2013 12:21:44 PM
Options Priority: Return Notification: Reply Requested: Sensitivity: Expiration Date: Recipients Received:	Standard No No Normal	

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: December 19, 2013 Received: December 18, 2013 Status: Pending_Post Tracking No. 1jx-89dc-a0ab Comments Due: December 20, 2013 Submission Type: Web

Docket: NRC-2012-0246

Consideration of Environmental Impacts on Temporary Storage of Spent Fuel After Cessation of Reactor Operation

Comment On: NRC-2012-0246-0456 Waste Confidence - Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel; Extension of Comment Period

Document: NRC-2012-0246-DRAFT-1066 Comment on FR Doc # 2013-26726

Submitter Information

Name: david taylor

General Comment

Nuclear power is touted as a clean, efficient alternative to fossil fuels and other alternatives (wind, solar). The problem with nuclear power is that the issue of accidents, the regular releases of radioactive isotopes during a plants operation, and nuclear waste is handled as if the public and taxpayers are elementary children.

Accidents are regularly covered up: eg. Santa Susana http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sodium_Reactor_Experiment

Investors won't touch nuclear plant construction and insurance because the liabilities are so massive

Cleanup is either socialized, or in the case of Fukushima, doesn't happen at all because TEPCO-the operator-is too concerned with profits. So instead of looking for the nuclear fuel melting through the reactor right after the accident on March 11, 2011, instead the core is permitted to melt down and poison the entire world. http://enenews.com/iaea-expert-molten-core-is-suspected-to-have-penetrated-containment-no-water-was-injected-for-28-hours

The press doesn't cover the largest industrial accident in mankind's history because they are told not to. That is the only explanation for the sparse coverage.

Radiation testing stations are shut down after the Fukushima accident because the governments don't want to protect their people.

Yet, prospective recycling technologies by scientists like RM Santelli is swept under the rug using heavy-

handed tactics: http://nuclearwasterecycling.com/

Why?

So it is as if our 'leaders' have been given a choice of nuclear power or life on earth, and have chosen nuclear power without consent of the people. Cancer rates are skyrocketing, background radiation has increased significantly the last 30 years. Tritium is regularly released by plants and is linked to diabetes. Downwinders have higher cancer incidences. If nuclear power was truly cheap then the profits from cheap power would easily pay for cleanups. Instead Somalia has radioactive tides, Hanford is contaminating aquifers and the DOE wants to put nuclear waste in silverware.

Only an insane person could reasonably continue to pursue this strategy. A small number of people are triggerring genocide. The end of the human race is possible with the bioaccumulation of all the nuclear waste that is already released into the environment.