

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>As of:</b> 1/8/18 4:52 PM <b>Received:</b> January 02, 2018 <b>Status:</b> Pending_Post <b>Tracking No.</b> 1k2-90pe-ksv3 <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-0048

Comment on FR Doc # 2017-24734

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Sara Allen

**Address:**

236 Avenida Lobeiro

Unit A

San Clemente, CA, 92672

**Email:** sacolcci@yahoo.com

(47)  
82 FR 52944  
11/15/2017

**SUNSI Review Complete**

Template = ADM - 013

E-RIDS= ADM-03

Add= Jeremy Smith (USF)

## General Comment

Regarding Docket ID NRC-2017-0211.

We find it extremely shortsighted that the NRC would even consider using sub-par containers to store hazardous waste. How about this instead- put some money up front and do the right thing! We have plenty of knowledge from our partners around the world to know that 10-19 inches is a better standard for this type of refuse. The thicker the better! To use vessels that are an inch or less thick is ridiculous - especially with the possible hazards of earthquakes, tsunamis, terrorist attacks!, let alone every day wear and tear. Beyond just the environmental negligence of this decision - if you are really only focused on money - how about somebody do a proper cost analysis on the upfront cost to build a suitable vessel vs. the cleanup mess

and long-term impact of a nuclear waste spill. Which begs the question... What IS our ocean worth? Clearly my husband and I have a different answer than the NRC.