

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 3:33 PM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Cc: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: PR-51 Waste Confidence
Attachments: 1284 miller.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#: 00859

Hearing Identifier: Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number: 895

Mail Envelope Properties (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0014435D7316D)

Subject: PR-51 Waste Confidence
Sent Date: 1/6/2014 3:33:09 PM
Received Date: 1/6/2014 3:33:09 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	1/6/2014 3:33:09 PM
1284 miller.pdf	80097	

Options

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

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: January 02, 2014 Received: December 20, 2013 Status: Pending_Post Tracking No. 1jx-89eq-glub 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-2012-0246-0361

Waste Confidence - Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel

Document: NRC-2012-0246-DRAFT-1284

Comment on FR Doc # 2013-21708

Submitter Information

Name: Daniel Miller

Address:

2025 Cheltenham CT

Woodbridge, 22192-2255

Email: millerdp@vt.edu

General Comment

I read the draft NUREG-2157 with great interest. I was particularly interested in the NRC's methodology used to engage the public with the development of the report. Unfortunately, it appears that the public was not directly involved in creation of the report, but was merely presented previously created information and asked to provide an assessment. For example, the report states that, "The NRC announced that it was planning to develop an EIS and requested comments..." (xxvi) which does not indicate the direct engagement of the public with the development of the EIS. Furthermore, while the statement that, "...technical knowledge and experience alone are not sufficient to bring about the broad social and political acceptance needed to construct a repository" (B-5) shows some recognition of the need to directly involve the public, it seems to imply that the effort to convince the public is simply an obstacle to overcome so the right solution can be implemented. While I appreciate the NRC's efforts to involve the public I argue that the public must be an active participant in the process of NRC rulemaking. These observations lead me to ask, "Did the NRC engage social-scientists as participants in their assessment?" A total focus upon the technical artifacts of an issue is a flawed approach. The NRC must fully address the nuclear waste problem with the full range of expert knowledge AND the public.

Daniel P. Miller, M.S.

Woodbridge, VA

(Gov. Manager - DoD)

Ph.D. Student

Science and Technology Studies

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University