

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>As of:</b> 1/8/18 4:22 PM <b>Received:</b> January 02, 2018 <b>Status:</b> Pending_Post <b>Tracking No.</b> 1k2-90pd-kqcy <b>Comments Due:</b> January 02, 2018 <b>Submission Type:</b> Web
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Docket:** NRC-2017-0211

Standard Review Plan for Spent Fuel Dry Storage Systems and Facilities

**Comment On:** NRC-2017-0211-0001

Standard Review Plan for Spent Fuel Dry Storage Systems and Facilities; Request for Comment on Draft NUREG

**Document:** NRC-2017-0211-DRAFT-0019

Comment on FR Doc # 2017-24734

(18)

82 FR 52944  
11/15/2017

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Benjamin Clarke

**Address:**

202 Termino Avenue  
Long Beach, CA, 90803

**SUNSI Review Complete**

**Template = ADM - 013**

**E-RIDS= ADM-03**

**Add= Jeremy Smith (Jas5)**

---

## General Comment

Hello,

I am writing to you concerning the NRC's new regulations for the storage of spent radioactive waste. I only found out today that the deadline for public commenting is today (this does seem an inadequate window for public comments).

So I am writing with a sense of urgency because the subject of radioactive waste storage is currently and literally hitting us where we live.

Honestly, I have not had the time to review the 600+ page document on the proposed new nuclear waste storage regulations. However, I hope that the new rules address my concerns about the impending storage underway at the decommissioned San Onofre nuclear power plant. I have been closely monitoring the situation and I am appalled at Southern California

Edison's plan to bury the waste:

- in relatively insubstantial containers with steel walls that are only 5/8" thick, that by all accounts have a likelihood of leaking or otherwise failing, and are only guaranteed for 25 years, which is exactly 1/10,000 the amount of time that the nuclear waste will be hazardous and deadly.
- on a public beach (which also makes it a potential terrorist target.)
- near a major freeway.
- extremely close to major cities.
- on an earthquake fault.
- in a tsunami zone.
- three feet above the water table, and just about 100 feet from the coastline.

Surely these conditions are NOT ideal for the storage of this deadly waste. In the event of a disaster, the structural integrity of this storage could become compromised, and create a disaster far worse than Chernobyl or Fukushima.

Southern California is a treasure of the world. I urge you to act in the interests of the people and all inhabitants of our region. Let's not allow conditions that logically, almost inevitably could lead to the utter devastation of our corner of the planet. San Onofre is a preventable disaster. I hope you will take the necessary steps to see that So Cal Edison meets a higher safety standard than they are apparently willing to do on their own.

Thank you for your consideration.