

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Thursday, December 26, 2013 1:44 PM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Cc: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: PR-51 Waste Confidence
Attachments: 1230 anonymous.pdf

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

PR#: PR-51

FRN#: 78FR56775

NRC DOCKET#: NRC-2012-0246

SECY DOCKET DATE: 12/20/13

TITLE: Waste Confidence—Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel

COMMENT#: 00720

Hearing Identifier: Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number: 746

Mail Envelope Properties (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0014433C4A145)

Subject: PR-51 Waste Confidence
Sent Date: 12/26/2013 1:44:21 PM
Received Date: 12/26/2013 1:44:22 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	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	254	12/26/2013 1:44:22 PM
1230 anonymous.pdf	78314	

Options

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

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: December 20, 2013 Received: December 20, 2013 Status: Pending_Post Tracking No. 1jx-89ej-z9qa 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-1230

Comment on FR Doc # 2013-26726

Submitter Information

Name: Anonymous Anonymous

General Comment

To Whom This May Concern:

There are so many statements casually stated on the storage of nuclear fuel "envisioned" by the NRC. Here are three suggestions as a conscious individual who also lives upon this planet, has no monetary vested interest but only a vested interest in a toxic-free world:

"Generic Address"--One cannot "generically address" the environmental impacts of spent nuclear fuel. One must be precise and far-sighted. A term like "generically address" does not specify future plan and/or historical repercussions on environment due to "spent nuclear fuel". Please be precise, clear, historically-accurate on future plans for environmental impact.

"Licensed life for operation of a reactor"--There is a reason that licenses for operation are granted. To store spent nuclear fuel behind the "licensed life for operation of a reactor" is akin to sweeping dirt under the rug instead of cleaning one's house. This public opinion votes "NO" to storage beyond licensed life.

Please spend any extra energy and defence federal monies on finding a way to neutralize the concentrated toxicity of spent nuclear fuel as well as finding safer ways to utilize existing energy without creating toxic residuals.

Credo states this better than myself, hence:

Make it a national priority to come up with real solutions to long term nuclear waste storage;

- Abandon the generic "one size fits all" approach and instead, make site-specific environmental reports and recommendations;

- Immediately reduce spent fuel pool density to original design standards, without exemptions;

- Accelerate ongoing hardened, on-site storage of spent fuel at all reactor sites.

- Cease production of all nuclear waste.

Thank you.