

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Wednesday, January 08, 2014 12:35 PM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Cc: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: PR-51 Waste Confidence
Attachments: Comment of Richard McCraney.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#: 00897

Hearing Identifier: Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number: 942

Mail Envelope Properties (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0014435D7374A)

Subject: PR-51 Waste Confidence
Sent Date: 1/8/2014 12:34:53 PM
Received Date: 1/8/2014 12:34:54 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 12:34:54 PM
Comment of Richard McCraney.pdf		77871

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. 3min	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:

THIS WAS MY FIRST VISIT TO AN NRC PUBLIC MEETING.
SO, I HAVE NO REAL FEEL FOR AN IMPROVEMENT
IN THE NRC'S PUBLIC MEETING PROCESSES)

POSSIBLY, A MOVEMENT WITHIN NRC MORE ~~ARRANGED~~
DIRECTLY INFLUENCING HIGHER LEVEL MANAGEMENT
IS IN ORDER TO SERVE PUBLIC INTEREST(S)

Please fold on the dotted lines with Business Reply side out, tape the bottom, and mail back to the NRC.

Please provide any additional comments:

OPTIONAL

Name RM Organization INTERESTED CITIZEN
Telephone No. E-Mail richard.mccraney@gmail.com ☐ Check here if you would like a member of NRC staff to contact you.

YOU MAY CONTACT ME IF YOU
REQUIRE PUBLIC CONTENT

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

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

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

