

## **Rulemaking1CEm Resource**

---

**From:** RulemakingComments Resource  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 08, 2014 12:36 PM  
**To:** Rulemaking1CEm Resource  
**Cc:** RulemakingComments Resource  
**Subject:** PR-51 Waste Confidence  
**Attachments:** Comment of Anonymous 6.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#:** 00898

**Hearing Identifier:** Secy\_RuleMaking\_comments\_Public  
**Email Number:** 943

**Mail Envelope Properties** (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0014435D7374C)

**Subject:** PR-51 Waste Confidence  
**Sent Date:** 1/8/2014 12:35:30 PM  
**Received Date:** 1/8/2014 12:35:30 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 12:35:30 PM
Comment of Anonymous 6.pdf	60857	

**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:

These should have been 2 day meetings

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 \_\_\_\_\_ Organization \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone No. \_\_\_\_\_ 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



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

