

As of: 2/26/16 2:39 PM  
Received: February 26, 2016  
Status: Pending Post  
Tracking No. 1k0-8o6i-t998  
Comments Due: February 29, 2016  
Submission Type: Web

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

**Docket:** NRC-2015-0251  
Draft Guidance Documents for Subsequent License Renewal

**Comment On:** NRC-2015-0251-0004  
Guidance: Subsequent License Renewal

**Document:** NRC-2015-0251-DRAFT-0010  
Comment on FR Doc # 2015-32368

*12/23/2015*  
*80 FR 79956*  
*7*  
RECEIVED  
2016 FEB 26 PM 2:38  
RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
DRAFT  
CENTRAL

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Meghan Belaski

## General Comment

Upon hearing the news that the invisible arm of our decrepit and derelict nuclear industry is seeking additional life-support for its brain-dead facilities around the U.S., in order to extend the life-span beyond original design capabilities, makes perfect sense in the regulatory environment the NRC has long operated in, and is obviously quite troubling given the past and current histories of many of the plants that are seeking this extension from the NRC today, likely resulting in a catastrophic event in the future when a site finally pulls the plug on itself if these DNR's are ignored now, and brought back to life without cause.

On a regular basis, too often in fact, the public is made aware of the stark realities of the degrading nature of our nuclear power plants around the U.S, due to crumbling nuclear infrastructure which includes failing power lines, back-up generators and pump system failures, radioactive flooding, fires, shut-downs, or scrams, IT systems from the 8-track era, known structural defects, falsified safety records, and failures to report incidents to the NRC, the fact almost none of these plants can stand up to a snowstorm, while sea-waters are rising, and maintaining the financials of an industry that apparently went bankrupt some time ago when no one was looking, is a curiosity to say the least. And in these proposed extensions are taxpayer monies propping up this dying industry, focused on 1 energy "solution" to global warming, at maximum cost, when the same taxpayer monies could fund multiple sources of RENEWABLE energy for half the cost a nuclear build or lifeline could ever offer. And it won't make you a nuclear refugee either.

This is a crime against America. Why aren't we demanding to know why we are being asked to further fund an industry that doesn't really know how to explain to the public much of anything about the life-cycle of our nuclear anthro-pocene? It's actually quite odd if you really think about it. How is nuclear "power" of any type so misunderstood by its own creators? How is it that scientists, who apparently harnessed this unrealized universal force, working for years from the onset of the Manhattan Project, to right now, didn't pass on the

*SUNSI Review Complete*  
*Template = ADM-013*

*F-RDS = ADM-03*  
*Ed = B. Brady (bub1)*  
*G. Mliron (SdB1)*

science that would implore us to properly administer a cradle-to-grave understanding and handling of the most lethal material and force known to man, even if it's packaged in industry soundbites as the ONLY way to save earth from climate disaster? These people are crazy. Seriously crazy.

I don't care if Bill Gates et al., say nuclear is the next energy miracle. He's wrong, and I would implore that he and the Foundation go spend a few weeks in Fukushima and Chernobyl, and press those numbers. Then come back and apply the same scenario to the most densely populated American cities within a similar radius to a nuclear plant and see what you come up with. No people. Abandoned cities. No agriculture. Polluted water. Cancers for generations and you're worried about Syrian refugees invading your borders folks? Just wait until you're a displaced American within America from a nuclear fallout incident, and 20 million people end up living where precisely? Where they work? Re-build lives? Cause they'll never go home. You'll find out very quickly that the Syrian friend was a better option. Consider us lucky for now. But forewarned later.

If I was to use an analogy to conjure up a vision about what this might look like, I thought about my first car. I was 16 in 1992. My parents bought me a "classic" automobile; a 1963 Ford Falcon in mint condition. My father was meticulous about the car, and took extra-special care of it in order to keep it "road-worthy". Even though the 1963 Falcon was in mint condition, it still was not as fast, powerful or reliable as the rest of the newer cars on the road in 1992 and I had to drive a little differently than everyone else on the road. But again this was 1992, and the cars certainly were not as fast or technologically advanced as they are now.

This is what I see the NRC proposing with these extensions for the nuclear industry. Putting a "classic" on the road while all the rest of the modern world and technology outpaces your broke-down and lethal energy source that, if it doesn't kill you instantly when a nuclear power falls-out in the USA, will kill generations of our families slowly and painfully from the radiation exposure from this revolutionary clean energy source. How is that we've let this become the only answer to climate change? It's not people. It's time to wake up and face the facts. Please do not extend the lifeline of these nuclear facilities. They are liabilities we cannot afford. It's time to fund innovative energy sources for our times. If Applebee's in California has to tell me some of their food may have ingredients that cause cancer, then apparently this industry has been kept alive by artificial means for 70 years too long now, and it's time to pull the plug.