

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Wednesday, January 08, 2014 12:30 PM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Cc: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: PR-51 Waste Confidence
Attachments: Comment of William Thome.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#: 00891

Hearing Identifier: Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number: 936

Mail Envelope Properties (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0014435D73740)

Subject: PR-51 Waste Confidence
Sent Date: 1/8/2014 12:30:09 PM
Received Date: 1/8/2014 12:30:10 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 12:30:10 PM
Comment of William Thome.pdf		84195

Options

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



NRC PUBLIC MEETING FEEDBACK

Category

3

Meeting Date: 12/02/2013

Meeting Title: Public Meeting to Receive Comments on the Waste Confidence DGEIS and Proposed Rule - Perrysburg, Ohio

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, fair and balanced.	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:

My understanding was that the meeting was to provide public input as to what could be done with nuclear waste. There didn't seem to be any discussion of that in the first 1-1/2 hours so three of us retired engineers left and didn't hear all the talks.

Most of the public comments were by anti-nuclear people. To them nuclear energy causes many problems with potentially huge future problems. I believe one of the speakers even mentioned Emerald Ash Borer being caused by nuclear waste. We have heard all their arguments before and there didn't seem to be anything new.

Two speakers spoke for nuclear power. First was a Ottawa County Commissioner. He was looking at the tax base and jobs provided by the Davis Besse plant. A second was a union leader from Columbus who liked the jobs provided in building nuclear plants.

None of the speakers addressed the stated purpose of the meeting of input on what to do with the nuclear waste. I believe the NRC should provide about ten minutes for the anti-nuclear group to present their case. After that any speaker who deviated from the intended purpose would have the microphone shut off and they would be asked to leave the podium. (Possibly police assistance would be required.) Then the NRC should present a technical presentation on what options have been considered with the pluses and minuses of each option. Then let the public comment on the options or other methods of handling the waste.

Please provide any additional comments:

~~COUNTY COMMISSIONER. HE WAS LOOKING AT THE TAX
BASE AND JOBS PROVIDED BY DAVIS BESSE. NEITHER
OF THESE ADDRESSED THE STATED PURPOSE OF THE MEETING.~~

~~I BELIEVE THE NRC SHOULD START WITH A TECHNICAL
PRESENTATION. WHAT OPTIONS HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED.
WHAT ARE THE PLUSES AND MINUSES OF EACH OPTION.
THE LET THE PUBLIC COMMENT ONLY OF THE OPTIONS,
TO KEEP THE "ANTI-NUKES" HAPPY GIVE THE 10 MINUTS
AT MAX.~~

OPTIONAL

Name WILLIAM L. THOME Organization RETIRED ENGINEER
Telephone No. 419-868-7978 E-Mail BILL.THOME@ATT.NET ☒ Check here if you would like a
member of NRC staff to contact you.

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY
COMMISSION
WASHINGTON DC 20555-0001



NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL

FIRST CLASS MAIL

PERMIT NO. 12904

WASHINGTON DC

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

ATTN: Sarah Lopas

064

MAIL STOP:
(HQ Staff Only) 3WFN-14C64

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

205559998

