

## **Rulemaking1CEm Resource**

---

**From:** RulemakingComments Resource  
**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 3:17 PM  
**To:** Rulemaking1CEm Resource  
**Cc:** RulemakingComments Resource  
**Subject:** PR-51 Waste Confidence  
**Attachments:** 1290 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#:** 00854

**Hearing Identifier:** Secy\_RuleMaking\_comments\_Public  
**Email Number:** 890

**Mail Envelope Properties** (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0014435D73153)

**Subject:** PR-51 Waste Confidence  
**Sent Date:** 1/6/2014 3:17:21 PM  
**Received Date:** 1/6/2014 3:17:23 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

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	254	1/6/2014 3:17:23 PM
1290 anonymous.pdf	81970	

**Options**

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

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>As of:</b> January 02, 2014
<b>Received:</b> December 21, 2013
<b>Status:</b> Pending_Post
<b>Tracking No.</b> 1jx-89et-o6bz
<b>Comments Due:</b> December 20, 2013
<b>Submission Type:</b> 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-1290

Comment on FR Doc # 2013-26726

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Anonymous Anonymous

---

## General Comment

I totally reject NRC's waste confidence Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS) and demand that you withdraw it for thorough revision. Based on the toxic pollution that lasts for thousands of years, I have NO confidence in NRC's waste confidence. The reality is, there is no reason on earth to continue with a "technology" that threatens life itself; the definition of "technology" should be "tools, created by humans to make their lives more livable." In reality, the nuclear "industry" and nuclear "technology" is destroying life. This is not an industry that instills confidence-quite the contrary.

I will not support an industry that is allowed to create wastes that it has no ability to or sound place for storage. In fact, I do not believe in any industry that creates more toxic waste. There is no spent-fuel/high-level radioactive waste disposal facility in operation and storing on site has been demonstrated to be a frightening option-as seen in Japan. Further, there is no "safe" method for disposing of nuclear waste. Therefore, it should not be allowed to manufacture any more of these wastes. Already, we have an enormous problem with what to do about the existing reactor waste.

NRC should not be allowed to issue new reactor licenses, nor grant license extensions to old operating reactors ever.No state is a waste dump! We don't want any more high-level radioactive wastes coming "to or through" our state. We do not wish to share our highways, roadways and oceans with nuclear waste. Storing it in hospital basements and on the edge of small towns is terrible. The entire approach to nuclear waste endangers public and environmental health; the idea of transporting high-level, long-lived radioactive waste coming to proposed so-called "centralize interim storage" waste facilities ("parking lot dumps") is unsound. Some have suggested that a permanent, deep-geological high-level radioactive waste disposal facility be built and fully operational to deal with existing waste. The possibility for this material, seeping into a molten area and together with multiple spent fuels, igniting at some point in the future, makes the option impossible to conceive of. Additionally, there is

absolutely NO consensus in the scientific community on how to deal with this technology. It is beyond faulty.

In light of the ongoing and uncontrolled horrors of the Fukushima Nuclear Crisis, which continues to spew hundreds of thousands of tons of highly radioactive water into the Pacific Ocean for nearly three years, with "sanctioned" plans to dump ALL the water into the Pacific, and continuing to burn unfiltered radioactive waste into the air, and the US-influenced IAEA and former NRC advisers to Japan recommending we "dump it all" into the ocean or store it in the deep sea; and no acceptable means of containment in sight, I cannot logically find any reason to continue to produce more nuclear waste. The nuclear "industry" and US government and other governments clearly do not know how to deal with the fallout of disasters, much less the ongoing waste product of an overpriced and inefficient energy industry that has proven itself, time and time again, to be ill-conceived.

Cancer is now the number one killer of children in the US, and the National Cancer Institute of Japan has sent brochures to all the children in elementary school telling them they should not fear cancer as almost everyone will die of cancer one day. How is nuclear a "safe" technology? In what world?

As a U.S. citizen, mother and professional, I am appalled that my government is involved in such a dangerous, unmanageable and out-of-control industry. Nuclear was a bad idea from the start, and now the waste problem will haunt us for generations. We can do better.

Respectfully,

Anonymous