

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Thursday, December 26, 2013 4:29 PM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Cc: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: PR-51 Waste Confidence
Attachments: 1181 sorgen.pdf

**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#: 00779

Hearing Identifier: Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number: 805

Mail Envelope Properties (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0014433C4A19E)

Subject: PR-51 Waste Confidence
Sent Date: 12/26/2013 4:28:38 PM
Received Date: 12/26/2013 4:28:38 PM
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	12/26/2013 4:28:38 PM
1181 sorgen.pdf	80246	

Options

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

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: December 20, 2013 Received: December 20, 2013 Status: Pending_Post Tracking No. 1jx-89eb-rkuz Comments Due: December 20, 2013 Submission Type: 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-1181

Comment on FR Doc # 2013-26726

Submitter Information

Name: Phoebe Sorgen

General Comment

It is in everyone's interest to Dry Cask as soon as possible. Two big probs with the hilariously misnamed "Waste Confidence" plan:

1) It's more costly to process and create the MOX fuel than to cask it. A study by Princeton presented April 4, 2008 to Congress estimated that processing MOX including the costs of the MOX facility and decommissioning the MOX facility is about 10 times more expensive than simply Dry Casking!

2) The MOX fuel is far more likely to explode in a Moderated Prompt Criticality. In the 1950's Argonne National Lab conducted a series of experiments that proved that even with normal nuclear fuel rods, an uncontrolled criticality could blow up the reactor. With MOX, enriched with bomb making plutonium, this type of nuclear explosion is much more likely, as occurred in Japan @ Fukushima Daiichi unit 3 which was running MOX. The amount of Uranium detected by the EPA in Saipan, Guam, Honolulu and California could only be caused by one thing....an explosion from within the reactor vessel that launched the inventory into the air. MOX is too dangerous! MOX can turn a 80 foot tall reactor with 6" steel walls into a "Canon" which can launch the entire inventory.

The Dry Cask is proven technology that can be produced in the USA, creating jobs in the USA and increasing safety, all at an affordable cost, which should be covered by the utilities because they had the obligation to decommission the reactors. If necessary, the US Government could assist the utilities by providing half the cost of the cask.

The last thing we need is more plutonium in our atmosphere.