

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Wednesday, January 08, 2014 12:21 PM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Cc: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: PR-51 Waste Confidence
Attachments: Comment of Brita Larsen Clark.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#: 00885

Hearing Identifier: Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number: 930

Mail Envelope Properties (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0014435D73723)

Subject: PR-51 Waste Confidence
Sent Date: 1/8/2014 12:21:24 PM
Received Date: 1/8/2014 12:21:24 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	1/8/2014 12:21:24 PM
Comment of Brita Larsen Clark.pdf		92484

Options

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



NRC PUBLIC MEETING FEEDBACK

Category

3

Meeting Date: November 4, 2013

Meeting Title: Public Meeting to Receive Comments on the Waste Confidence Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Rule - Charlotte, NC

Thank you for attending this public meeting hosted by the NRC. In order to help us understand your views about this meeting and improve future meetings, please take a couple minutes to answer the following questions.

Please address the following statements in terms of your experience at the meeting. 1 is "strongly disagree" and 5 is "strongly agree."

	"STRONGLY DISAGREE"	"DISAGREE"	"NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE"	"AGREE"	"STRONGLY AGREE"
1. The meeting achieved its stated purpose.	1	2	3	4	5
2. This meeting helped me to understand the topics discussed.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The meeting location, starting time, and duration were reasonably convenient.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The meeting facility, room set up, microphones, and visuals used contributed to the success of the meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Attendees were given sufficient opportunity to ask questions or express their views.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Attendees were listened to and understood by NRC staff.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The presentations and explanations given by the NRC staff were understandable <u>fair and balanced</u> NO	1	2	3	4	5
8. I am satisfied overall with the NRC staff who participated in the meeting.	1	2	3	4	5

Please provide any suggestions you have on ways the NRC could improve their public meetings:

It was hard to know if we were "listened to and understood" by the staff.
I was concerned that the NRC speakers, others supporting the GEIS did not seem acknowledge that the problem of long-term high level waste disposal is very complex, with no clear "good" solution. They seemed to dismiss many of the concerns expressed by the public speakers.

Please provide any additional comments:

If the staff had forthrightly addressed the fact that there are many difficulties ahead, (instead of blithely dismissing them), it would be harder for concerned citizens to assume that they (the staff) are biased rather than ~~so~~ neutral guardians of the public safety.

OPTIONAL

Name BRIAN LARSEN CLARK Organization PSR


Telephone No. (828) 633-0892 E-Mail _____

☐ Check here if you would like a member of NRC staff to contact you.

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY
COMMISSION
WASHINGTON DC 20555-0001

GREENVILLE SC 296

18 NOV 2013 PM 6 T



BUSINESS REPLY MAIL

FIRST CLASS MAIL

PERMIT NO. 12904

WASHINGTON DC

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ATTN: TR Rowe
NMSS/WCD

MAIL STOP:
(HQ Staff Only) 3WFN14-C64

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001