

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Thursday, December 26, 2013 1:56 PM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Cc: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: PR-51 Waste Confidence
Attachments: 1238 hisasue.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#: 00728

Hearing Identifier: Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number: 754

Mail Envelope Properties (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0014433C4A14F)

Subject: PR-51 Waste Confidence
Sent Date: 12/26/2013 1:55:32 PM
Received Date: 12/26/2013 1:55:33 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 1:55:33 PM
1238 hisasue.pdf	82918	

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-89e1-kr9b
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-2012-0246-0361

Waste Confidence - Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel

Document: NRC-2012-0246-DRAFT-1238

Comment on FR Doc # 2013-21708

Submitter Information

Name: Carole Hisasue

General Comment

I am sure you have gotten many valid comments by now and I am probably echoing many of them, but here are a few points I'd like to make.

- The GEIS is flawed. We are dealing with something that will stay lethal for tens of thousands of years but the study does not take any of that into consideration. It is NOT feasible for this highly radioactive material to be safely stored FOREVER. Nor can we expect to find a geologic repository -- Yucca Mountain turned out to be completely wrong -- geologically -- and furthermore, are you suggesting we turn the planet into a radioactive dump? Waste needs to be dealt with and if you can't, you have to stop making it. Perhaps in the future there will be a scientific rather than geologic solution in which man can neutralize the deadly by-products of nuclear fission. Until that time, you need to suspend all nuclear power plant operations and stop creating more waste. Nobody really has a clue as to what to do with it other than hope, pray, believe that nothing will happen to start a radiological release.

- You've asked everyone to have "confidence" that you'll find a permanent solution to the nuclear waste problem when the first power plant went into operation in the mid-50's. Decades later, you are asking us again to believe that you will find one in 60 years. What faith do we have? None. Yet without a solution in place, you continue to allow power plants to remain in operation, creating more waste. The TEMPORARY answer to this problem is to stop making more waste! And then. we need to find a permanent solution to the radioactive waste that has already been created.

- Right now, it looks like the waste will be stored indefinitely on-site and you are trying to create a regulatory system for it but can you even imagine that far into the future? America as you know it has only been around for a couple hundred years. Europeans have only been on this land for several hundred. Maybe you need to talk to

those who have lived here continuously for over 20,000 years. Moreover, even in the very short term, there are governmental problems. The Waste Confidence meetings were postponed because of a government shut down. The very government and organization responsible for the extremely toxic radioactive waste. This hardly inspired confidence.

- I am horrified with the conclusion of the draft study against accelerated transfer of radioactive waste from the pools to dry casks being based on a cost/benefit analysis. Cost/benefit?! Isn't our safety supposed to be top priority? Who do you work for? If you are not working for the tax payers who support you, should you not instead be getting paid by the nuclear industry?

- Beyond the waste issue, the nuclear industry is fraught with too many hazards that have the potential of an enormous catastrophic disaster. We need to phase out not only nuclear power but the entire industry and I realize this goes against what the NRC is here to do, but it seems like you are coming up with inadequate solutions to keep the industry (including yourselves) going. You keep talking about the "lessons from Fukushima" but are you paying attention? The real lesson is that we cannot afford nuclear power -- it will be our undoing. The only reason why the entire world is not in a panic over the continuing catastrophe in Fukushima is that we cannot "see" radiation. There are no photos or videos like those of an oil spill so it's easy for some to ignore. What we have is a whole lot worse and if one could see it, the nuclear power industry would be dead by now -- nearly 3 years of the ongoing situation at Fukushima. It's just not worth it. Invest in renewable, clean energy. Conserve. Be smart. And, most importantly, keep the planet viable for humanity.

In terms of our local nuclear power plant, Diablo Canyon... I am a rancher living only seven miles from the facility, so I have everything at stake here. I love this county and am very supportive of our community. I know many residents are happy with PG&E but I believe they can be providing jobs and electricity in much, much better ways. There are plenty of natural resources available (and many untapped) -- solar, wind, tidal -- that would make this county, and country, far safer. Let's not wait until a disaster occurs!! Let's take the lessons from Fukushima to heart.