

## **Rulemaking1CEm Resource**

---

**From:** RulemakingComments Resource  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 24, 2013 11:59 AM  
**To:** Rulemaking1CEm Resource  
**Cc:** RulemakingComments Resource  
**Subject:** PR-51 Waste Confidence  
**Attachments:** 1116 anonymous.pdf

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

**PR#:** PR-51  
**FRN#:** 78FR56775  
**NRC DOCKET#:** NRC-2012-0246  
**SECY DOCKET DATE:** 12/19/13  
**TITLE:** Waste Confidence—Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel  
**COMMENT#:** 00654

**Hearing Identifier:** Secy\_RuleMaking\_comments\_Public  
**Email Number:** 678

**Mail Envelope Properties** (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0014433C4A045)

**Subject:** PR-51 Waste Confidence  
**Sent Date:** 12/24/2013 11:59:24 AM  
**Received Date:** 12/24/2013 11:59:24 AM  
**From:** RulemakingComments Resource

**Created By:** RulemakingComments.Resource@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"RulemakingComments Resource" <RulemakingComments.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Rulemaking1CEM Resource" <Rulemaking1CEM.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	254	12/24/2013 11:59:24 AM
1116 anonymous.pdf	81043	

**Options**

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

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>As of:</b> December 20, 2013 <b>Received:</b> December 19, 2013 <b>Status:</b> Pending_Post <b>Tracking No.</b> 1jx-89du-wep6 <b>Comments Due:</b> December 20, 2013 <b>Submission Type:</b> Web
--

**Docket:** NRC-2012-0246

Consideration of Environmental Impacts on Temporary Storage of Spent Fuel After Cessation of Reactor Operation

**Comment On:** NRC-2012-0246-0456

Waste Confidence - Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel; Extension of Comment Period

**Document:** NRC-2012-0246-DRAFT-1116

Comment on FR Doc # 2013-26726

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Brian Anonymous

---

## General Comment

There are two types of bridges in this world: those that have failed, and those that have yet to fail. While a bridge falling down can be a tragic thing, especially when there are people on it, its total amount of devastation can be calculated by things like it's length, height, etc. The maximum number of lives it can take is directly proportional to the number of people on or below it.

A nuclear power plant, on the other hand, is a very different type of "bridge." When they fail, as we have seen in Chernobyl and Fukushima, they cause massive devastation for decades, possibly centuries, with an ever-increasing number of dead and suffering. From my understanding, we build nuclear power plants for only two reasons: to generate electricity, or to build nuclear weapons. Proponents of nuclear power will argue that they are less harmful to the environment than coal plants. This argument is ridiculous, and anyone suggesting this simply needs to look at the mining operations where uranium is gathered, or the island of Japan, to see what can happen when things go terribly wrong. The three core meltdowns in Japan are quite literally out of our control. There doesn't seem to be anything we can do about it at this point. We are actually suggesting ideas like building a wall of ice to contain the situation. In my experience, when I pull an ice cube out of the freezer, it instantly starts to melt. And to the best of my knowledge, the corium (melted fuel rods), is, by most peoples standards, quite warm.

It's been nearly three years since the earthquake and tsunami that destroyed the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear power plant, and there is hardly a peep about it on the corporate news. This can be described as a media blackout. Obviously the nuclear power industry is very powerful, with teams of lobbyists, lawyers, apologists, "scientists" who claim it's safe, etc. It's no wonder to me that the news isn't reporting on it. But the honest truth is that this situation is bigger than anything else the news could possibly be reporting on. Budget deficits, immigration reform laws, congressional gridlock is all going to take a back seat when a critical mass of people start to realize

that everything in the Northern hemisphere is poisoned, and demand to know more about it. All food is radioactive, and the water might now give you cancer. It took TEPCO over two years to admit that the reactor core in reactor unit 1 (I believe) melted down in a matter of hours, not days.

I'm not an authority on the subject, but I am an electrical engineer who is fascinated with radioactive physics. I have a couple of geiger counters, and am part of a network actively collecting and sharing data on the situation, and I'm now actively seeking work in the Southern hemisphere. Small bits of uranium pellets have been found hundreds of miles away from the Fukushima Daiichi plant, suggesting to me that it's now saturated the Northern hemisphere, and the only way to escape it is to move South.

I don't mean to be an alarmist, but I am a realist. The situation is very bad, and what's worse is that all of my friends and family, except for a few exceptions, have no idea what I'm talking about when I mention the irradiation of the Northern hemisphere. I have to start explaining the situation in very basic terms, and finally lead up to the current situation. It can take hours, or days, to explain what's going on.

The bottom line is that if we want to contain the situation as best we can, it is imperative that we shut down and dismantle the remaining nuclear power stations immediately. What's worse than one nuclear power plant spewing radiation into the environment? Two nuclear power plants spewing radiation into the environment! And who's idea was it to build a nuclear power plant on fault lines along the ring of fire, anyway? One day I may have to explain to my grandchildren why greedy politicians and power companies built toxic power plants that have the capacity to destroy all life on earth, and I'm not looking forward to that day.

Shut them down! Shut them all down! End this ridiculous idea that we can somehow control what cannot be controlled. Yes, all nuclear power plants are "safe," until they fail and rapidly become "unsafe."

If you choose to believe that small amounts of radiation can actually be good for you, as Ann Coulter suggested, then it's perfectly clear you have absolutely no idea what ionizing radiation is and what it can do. I, for one, don't want leukemia, therefore I'm moving to the Southern hemisphere, and I suggest you consider doing the same.

Sincerely,

A concerned hominid.