

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Tuesday, December 24, 2013 8:35 AM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Subject: FW: Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement Supporting the Rulemaking to Update the Waste Confidence Decision and Rule (Docket ID: NRC-2012-0246)

**DOCKETED BY USNRC—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
SECY-067**

PR#: PR-51

FRN#: 78FR56775

NRC DOCKET#: NRC-2012-0246

SECY DOCKET DATE: 12/20/13

TITLE: Waste Confidence—Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel

COMMENT#: 00623

From: BG [<mailto:thinkcivic@gmail.com>]

Sent: Friday, December 20, 2013 12:48 PM

To: RulemakingComments Resource

Subject: Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement Supporting the Rulemaking to Update the Waste Confidence Decision and Rule (Docket ID: NRC-2012-0246)

I must say first of all that the term "confidence" when used to refer to nuclear waste is an oxymoron.

To pretend that nuclear 'waste confidence' can be handled as a public relations/ terminology issue is to deny reality. Let it be recognized that if there is no informed confidence as to handling of nuclear waste it is insane and immoral to continue *making* nuclear waste.

The intractable problem of storing ever-increasing quantities of spent nuclear fuel is best approached by not making any more of it.

I believe it is obvious that the long-term costs of waste disposal/storage are so great as to make it impossible to operate nuclear power plants cost-effectively. Nuclear waste management will become the most expensive component of using nuclear power. Not recognizing this fact is to side-step reality.

The Waste Confidence Decision cannot be interpreted as so limited in scope that the lunacy of producing more waste is not even considered.

Probabilistic Risk Assessments are empty words and math when they fail utterly to assess the dangers of ongoing operations with no end in sight. The 100-year flood or earthquake WILL happen.

Dry cask *tests* have failed (e.g., at Aberdeen Proving Grounds).. But we cannot afford even *one* failure of a loaded dry cask.

Discussions of terrorist attack scenarios are a waste of time if they are restricted to convenient testing options. Get real!

It needs to be pointed out that claims made by the Nuclear Energy Institute are nothing but self-serving business PR. Their claims consist of twisted logic and should not be considered. Of course the NEI has a vested interest in the outcome of this Waste Confidence Decision. Of course the NEI shows bias at every juncture in favor of the nuclear industry (which funds them).

Of course public safety is not on the NEI's radar, but it needs to be at the center of the waste issue.

B

.

G

early

Tulsa, OK

thinkcivic@gmail.com

Protect Clean Air, Clean Water, Clean Food

Hearing Identifier: Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number: 648

Mail Envelope Properties (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0014433C49F90)

Subject: FW: Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement Supporting the Rulemaking to Update the Waste Confidence Decision and Rule (Docket ID: NRC-2012-0246)
Sent Date: 12/24/2013 8:35:01 AM
Received Date: 12/24/2013 8:35:01 AM
From: RulemakingComments Resource

Created By: RulemakingComments.Resource@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Rulemaking1CEM Resource" <Rulemaking1CEM.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2656	12/24/2013 8:35:01 AM

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: