

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE PR 20

68FR09595

From: "brian melrose" <brianmelrose@hotmail.com>
To: <secy@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jun 27, 2003 2:57 PM
Subject: No to Nuclear Waste in My Consumer Goods, Construction Materials, Etc!

1883

DOCKETED
USNRC

June 27, 2003 (3:15PM)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Dear Secretary,

I don't normally write letters of complaint or response unless an issue particularly appeals to me. The issue of nuclear deregulation is one I strongly oppose as a citizen of the United States.

I am writing in regard to the Feb. 28 Federal Register issue of "controlling the disposition of solid materials." (68 FR 40: 9595-9602) The main issue is that of deregulating nuclear waste.

Haven't we learned from Three Mile Island? Haven't we learned from Chernobyl? Haven't we learned from the effects of depleted uranium in the first Gulf War? I guess we've learned what we already knew, that nuclear is dangerous; even its byproducts remain radioactive for millions of years. Just talk to some Gulf War veterans. An inordinate number have Gulf War syndrome attributed in part to the use of DU. So, now the same government that exposes its own troops to radioactive waste wants to be an equal opportunity employer. They want us all to have the joys of contact with nuclear waste byproducts. Those same people in Congress should take a trip over to Ukraine around the Chernobyl site and then come back and see if they still feel that nuclear can be safe, especially in a terrorist environment.

The "solid materials" mentioned in the report could be contaminated with plutonium-239, strontium-90, cobalt-60 or any radionuclide from nuclear power production. The NRC has compared their disposal dilemma to that of other industrial or household cleanup efforts. No nuclear waste in unrestricted or 'restricted' commercial daily use! No nuclear waste in local landfills with normal trash; nuclear waste is not normal trash!

No nuclear waste in metal and concrete. I'm sure the Unions would agree!

No nuclear waste in our soil, asphalt, building rubble, equipment, tools, glass, plastic, paper.

We have seen what the additive MTBE has done to the water system, leaking under the gas stations and contaminating large amounts of water, with only a few parts per billion. Now, you want to deregulate nuclear waste in our soil, too. What about the farmers, livestock, our food supply? Is it OK to contaminate our whole natural environment along with the artificial of man-made goods so that no aspect will be free of nuclear contaminants?

This time the NRC is coming in with rigged and biased studies and policies of nuclear promoters around the world (that the NRC funded) that claim to predict the doses the public will receive from the nuclear waste that gets made into everyday consumer products. These are intended to provide "scientific justification" for allowing nuclear waste to go out of regulatory control and into the marketplace. How much radiation dose do I want to receive from deregulated waste? Let me think...Absolutely none! Pro-nuclear committees have chosen 1 millirem/year as a "trivial" dose, even though that dose can never be verified or proven trivial. The Feb. 28 Federal Register notice is vague about what a 1 millirem dose criterion means: whether it is per waste type, per item, per facility, and how many of these 'negligible' doses we can get. So, there needs

to be more studies done.

You need to look outside corporate-funded and industry-funded studies that are biased for their monetary gains at the expense of others lives. It's time to seek out the truth and incorporate studies by such groups as the NIRS, who include public health and safety as factors.

It's a fact that the NRC attempting to get over the hump this time, has come in with rigged and biased studies from policies of nuclear promoters around the world (that in many cases NRC helped write or fund). They claim to predict the doses the public will receive from the nuclear waste that gets made into consumer products. These are intended to provide "scientific justification" for allowing nuclear waste to go out of regulatory control and into the marketplace.

To justify releasing and reusing contaminated radioactive metal and concrete, NRC is relying heavily on an SAIC (Science Applications International Corporation)--produced document (NURED 1640). It was generated by SAIC for NRC while SAIC was fulfilling a \$286 million DOE contract to recycle radioactive metal from nuclear power and weapons fuel enrichment. Although the company was let go when the conflict was made public, NRC is still using this document to justify this rulemaking.

Another disturbing fact is that one of NRC's goals is to reduce the regulatory burden on stakeholders: i.e- nuclear waste generators. So, you would like to release that burden from those who have created it and put it on the innocent public, making us guinea pigs in your experiment that we will fund with our own TAX DOLLARS! So, you want me to agree to pay you for shortening my own life. It's time to abort this dangerous policy of profit over people in the government, especially in the NRC.

I agree with the NIRS, that the best way to simplify the process and its burden of calculating dose and determining where each waste goes, would be to simply treat nuclear waste as nuclear waste. It SHOULD NOT be released into consumer products at all.

All radioactive waste and any materials contaminated with radioactivity from the nuclear fuel chain ABSOLUTELY MUST BE kept regulated in specifically licensed facilities with the goal of isolating it from the environment and preventing exposure to human, animal, and plant life.

Nuclear waste can contaminate for millions of years. Nuclear power reactors and their support facilities along the fuel-chain generate the vast majority (in volume and radioactivity) of nuclear waste contaminated with long-lasting (into the millions of years) radioactivity.

Does this sound like something you want you children playing near? Does this sound like something you want your child's rubber ducky made out of? Nuclear has lead us to the duck and cover. It's used by states to prevent them from being sitting ducks of countries with nukes. Now, we want to bail out the lame duck nuclear industry by helping them dispose of their waste and put it into the mainstream consumer environment. If this measure is approved, it will send a very wrong signal. Nuclear industry will be publicly funded and held irresponsible for any major

catastophes and cleanup of waste. Terrorists will be licking their chops to use our own nuclear power against us. The American public and other creatures in the environment will be left to fend for themselves in a "radioactive consumer nation." We will all be "dead ducks."

It's a slippery slope and a wrong message. Nuclear needs to be controlled and eventually abolished, not deregulated. I hope you will consider my opinion and that I only use some of this harsh language to make my point heard. I feel strongly against the proposed measure. Our government has already allowed unproven GMO's into our food supply. Nuclear waste products are also unproven in safety. They sound like 'mad scientist' experiments but they are happening or being proposed. Just because most of the rest of the public is not informed on this issue does not mean they agree with the measure. It's common sense. A byproduct of something as dangerous and radioactive as nuclear CANNOT be safe for the public. I am also writing on behalf of fellow DC and MD citizens who I know would agree with me in opposing this unsafe, impractical measure that benefits industry and profit at the expense of public health. Please consider my opinion and other members of the public who have written in on this subject before coming to a decision.

Thank you,

Brian Melrose

MSN 8 helps ELIMINATE E-MAIL VIRUSES. Get 2 months FREE*.