

Tully, Bridin

From: Robert Chinnery <robert.chinnery@talktalk.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 4:19 PM
To: NRCExecSec Resource
Subject: FW: Reactor licensing decisions must consider the environmental impacts of high-density spent fuel storage

-----Original Message-----

From: Robert Chinnery [mailto:robert.chinnery@talktalk.net]

Sent: 11 March 2014 21:09

To: secretary@nrc.gov

Subject: Reactor licensing decisions must consider the environmental impacts of high-density spent fuel storage.

Dear Chairman MacFarlane:

(cc: Commissioner Apostolakis, Commissioner Magwood, Commissioner Ostendorff and Commissioner Svinicki)

As part of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's process of integrating lessons learned from Fukushima, NRC staff issued an analysis of expedited transfer of spent fuel in November 2013. This analysis contained new and significant information that should be integrated into the NRC's regulations regarding environmental impacts of spent fuel storage during reactor operation as well as reactor licensing and relicensing regulations. On February 18, Friends of the Earth's legal counsel Diane Curran submitted a petition to this effect, and I am asking that you support this petition by publishing it in the federal register.

As acknowledged in your 2003 article, "Reducing the Hazards from Stored Spent Power-Reactor Fuel in the United States," the density of U.S. spent fuel pools creates an unnecessary risk of catastrophic radiation releases due to spent fuel pool fires. This article supports the NRC staff's November 2013 conclusion that the consequences of a spent fuel pool fire would devastate large areas. I wholeheartedly support your article's recommendation that "all spent fuel be transferred from wet to dry storage within five years of discharge."

Keeping in mind the consequences of a spent fuel pool fire as revealed in the NRC staff's November 2013 analysis, the increased safety of storing spent nuclear fuel in dry casks and the NRC's mission to protect people and the environment it is clear that the NRC must require the transfer of spent nuclear fuel to dry cask storage. While it may be costly to create new dry cask storage infrastructure at reactor sites, it will be far less costly than remediating a spent fuel pool fire. A spent fuel pool fire may be unlikely but it is far from impossible. The tragedy at Fukushima should have taught the world not to conflate unlikely with impossible.

On this third anniversary of the triple meltdown at Fukushima, please shepherd the "lessons learned" process responsibly by integrating new and significant information into the NRC's spent fuel storage and reactor licensing rules.

Sincerely,

Robert Chinnery

RM17 6SG

--

I am using the free version of SPAMfighter.

SPAMfighter has removed 1371 of my spam emails to date.

Get the free SPAMfighter here: <http://www.spamfighter.com/en>

Do you have a slow PC? Try a Free scan <http://www.spamfighter.com/SLOW-PCfighter?cid=sigen>

Joosten, Sandy

From: Martha Kirby <mk56@drexel.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 2:21 PM
To: CHAIRMAN Resource; CMRAPOSTOLAKIS Resource; CMRMAGWOOD Resource; CMROSTENDORFF Resource; CMRSVINICKI Resource
Subject: Reactor licensing decisions must consider environmental impacts of high-density spent fuel storage

Dear Chairman MacFarlane:
(cc: Commissioner Apostolakis, Commissioner Magwood, Commissioner Ostendorff and Commissioner Svinicki)

As part of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's process of integrating lessons learned from Fukushima, NRC staff issued an analysis of expedited transfer of spent fuel in November 2013. This analysis contained new and significant information that should be integrated into the NRC's regulations regarding environmental impacts of spent fuel storage during reactor operation as well as reactor licensing and relicensing regulations.

On February 18, Friends of the Earth's legal counsel Diane Curran submitted a petition to this effect. I ask that you support this petition by publishing it in the federal register.

As acknowledged in your 2003 article, "Reducing the Hazards from Stored Spent Power-Reactor Fuel in the United States," the density of U.S. spent fuel pools creates an unnecessary risk of catastrophic radiation releases due to spent fuel pool fires. This article supports the NRC staff's November 2013 conclusion that the consequences of a spent fuel pool fire would devastate large areas. I support your article's recommendation that "all spent fuel be transferred from wet to dry storage within five years of discharge."

The consequences of a spent fuel pool fire (as revealed in NRC staff's November 2013 analysis), the increased safety of dry casks for storing spent nuclear fuel, and NRC's mission to protect people and the environment all make it clear that the NRC must require transfer of spent nuclear fuel to dry cask storage.

It may be costly to create new dry cask storage infrastructure at reactor sites, but it will be far less costly than remediating a spent fuel pool fire. A spent fuel pool fire may be unlikely but it is far from impossible. The tragedy at Fukushima should have taught the world not to conflate unlikely with impossible.

On this third anniversary of the triple meltdown at Fukushima, please shepherd the "lessons learned" process responsibly by integrating new and significant information into the NRC's spent fuel storage and reactor licensing rules.

Sincerely,

M Kirby

19129

Remsburg, Kristy

From: Edward Thornton <ert@sas.upenn.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 3:11 PM
To: OPA Resource
Subject: Reactor licensing decisions must consider the

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by

Edward Thornton (ert@sas.upenn.edu) on Wednesday, March 12, 2014 at 15:11:20

through the IP 23.63.227.37

using the form at <http://www.nrc.gov/about-nrc/public-affairs/contact-opa.html>

and resulted in this email to opa.resource@nrc.gov

comments: I could not find a way to send this letter directly, so I am hoping it can be forwarded to Chairman MacFarlane, Commissioner Apostolakis, Commissioner Magwood, Commissioner Ostendorff, and Commissioner Svinicki. Thank you.
Ed Thornton

Dear Chairman MacFarlane:

(cc: Commissioner Apostolakis, Commissioner Magwood, Commissioner Ostendorff and Commissioner Svinicki)

I am writing to urge you to take action to require the best possible improvements in reactor safety. The nuclear power industry must be required to implement these as part of the cost of continuing to produce and sell nuclear power.

As part of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's process of integrating lessons learned from Fukushima, NRC staff issued an analysis of expedited transfer of spent fuel in November 2013. This analysis contained new and significant information that should be integrated into the NRC's regulations regarding environmental impacts of spent fuel storage during reactor operation as well as reactor licensing and relicensing regulations. On February 18, Friends of the Earth's legal counsel Diane Curran submitted a petition to this effect, and I am asking that you support this petition by publishing it in the federal register.

As acknowledged in your 2003 article, "Reducing the Hazards from Stored Spent Power-Reactor Fuel in the United States," the density of U.S. spent fuel pools creates an unnecessary risk of catastrophic radiation releases due to spent fuel pool fires. This article supports the NRC staff's November 2013 conclusion that the consequences of a spent fuel pool fire would devastate large areas. I wholeheartedly support your article's recommendation that "all spent fuel be transferred from wet to dry storage within five years of discharge."

Keeping in mind the consequences of a spent fuel pool fire as revealed in the NRC staff's November 2013 analysis, the increased safety of storing spent nuclear fuel in dry casks and the NRC's mission to protect people and the environment it is clear that the NRC must require the transfer of spent nuclear fuel to dry cask storage. While it may be costly to create new dry cask storage infrastructure at reactor sites, it will be far less costly than remediating a spent fuel pool fire. A spent fuel pool fire may be unlikely but it is far from impossible. The tragedy at Fukushima should have taught the world not to conflate unlikely with impossible.

On this third anniversary of the triple meltdown at Fukushima, please shepherd the “lessons learned” process responsibly by integrating new and significant information into the NRC’s spent fuel storage and reactor licensing rules.

Sincerely,

Edward Thornton

19081

organization:

address1: 7 Swarthmore Place

address2:

city: Swarthmore

state: PA

zip: 19081

country: USA

phone:

Tully, Bridin

From: m_port <m_port@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2014 11:13 PM
To: CHAIRMAN Resource
Subject: Reactor licensing decisions must consider the environmental impacts of high-density spent fuel storage

Dear Chairman MacFarlane:

(cc: Commissioner Apostolakis, Commissioner Magwood, Commissioner Ostendorff and Commissioner Svinicki)

As part of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's process of integrating lessons learned from Fukushima, NRC staff issued an analysis of expedited transfer of spent fuel in November 2013. This analysis contained new and significant information that should be integrated into the NRC's regulations regarding environmental impacts of spent fuel storage during reactor operation as well as reactor licensing and relicensing regulations. On February 18, Friends of the Earth's legal counsel Diane Curran submitted a petition to this effect, and I am asking that you support this petition by publishing it in the federal register.

As acknowledged in your 2003 article, "Reducing the Hazards from Stored Spent Power-Reactor Fuel in the United States," the density of U.S. spent fuel pools creates an unnecessary risk of catastrophic radiation releases due to spent fuel pool fires. This article supports the NRC staff's November 2013 conclusion that the consequences of a spent fuel pool fire would devastate large areas. I wholeheartedly support your article's recommendation that "all spent fuel be transferred from wet to dry storage within five years of discharge."

Keeping in mind the consequences of a spent fuel pool fire as revealed in the NRC staff's November 2013 analysis, the increased safety of storing spent nuclear fuel in dry casks and the NRC's mission to protect people and the environment it is clear that the NRC must require the transfer of spent nuclear fuel to dry cask storage. While it may be costly to create new dry cask storage infrastructure at reactor sites, it will be far less costly than remediating a spent fuel pool fire. A spent fuel pool fire may be unlikely but it is far from impossible. The tragedy at Fukushima should have taught the world not to conflate unlikely with impossible.

On this third anniversary of the triple meltdown at Fukushima, please shepherd the "lessons learned" process responsibly by integrating new and significant information into the NRC's spent fuel storage and reactor licensing rules.

Sincerely,

M Port

33472

Tully, Bridin

From: MAL <sellart@earthlink.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2014 6:17 PM
To: CHAIRMAN Resource
Cc: CMRAPOSTOLAKIS Resource; CMRMAGWOOD Resource; CMROSTENDORFF Resource; CMRSVINICKI Resource
Subject: new info integrated into regs

Dear Chairman MacFarlane:
(cc: Commissioner Apostolakis, Commissioner Magwood, Commissioner Ostendorff and Commissioner Svinicki)

As part of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's process of integrating lessons learned from Fukushima, NRC staff issued an analysis of expedited transfer of spent fuel in November 2013. This analysis contained new and significant information that should be integrated into the NRC's regulations regarding environmental impacts of spent fuel storage during reactor operation as well as reactor licensing and relicensing regulations. On February 18, Friends of the Earth's legal counsel Diane Curran submitted a petition to this effect, and I am asking that you support this petition by publishing it in the federal register.

As acknowledged in your 2003 article, "Reducing the Hazards from Stored Spent Power-Reactor Fuel in the United States," the density of U.S. spent fuel pools creates an unnecessary risk of catastrophic radiation releases due to spent fuel pool fires. This article supports the NRC staff's November 2013 conclusion that the consequences of a spent fuel pool fire would devastate large areas. I wholeheartedly support your article's recommendation that "all spent fuel be transferred from wet to dry storage within five years of discharge."

Keeping in mind the consequences of a spent fuel pool fire as revealed in the NRC staff's November 2013 analysis, the increased safety of storing spent nuclear fuel in dry casks and the NRC's mission to protect people and the environment it is clear that the NRC must require the transfer of spent nuclear fuel to dry cask storage. While it may be costly to create new dry cask storage infrastructure at reactor sites, it will be far less costly than remediating a spent fuel pool fire. A spent fuel pool fire may be unlikely but it is far from impossible. The tragedy at Fukushima should have taught the world not to conflate unlikely with impossible. DUE TO THE DIRE CONSEQUENCES, THE NUCLEAR INDUSTRIES CANNOT TAKE RISKS. I'M SURE THAT YOUR PRIORITIES ARE TO PROTECT THE WORLD FROM CATASTROPHIC DISASTERS. I PERSONALLY WOULD LIKE TO SEE ALL NUCLEAR USE ELIMINATED.

On this third anniversary of the triple meltdown at Fukushima, please shepherd the "lessons learned" process responsibly by integrating new and significant information into the NRC's spent fuel storage and reactor licensing rules.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Leitch

19147