

Rulemaking1CEm Resource

From: RulemakingComments Resource
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 7:47 AM
To: Rulemaking1CEm Resource
Cc: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: PR-51 Waste Confidence
Attachments: Comment of Corinne Carey.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#: 00915

Hearing Identifier: Secy_RuleMaking_comments_Public
Email Number: 960

Mail Envelope Properties (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0014435FE4BA6)

Subject: PR-51 Waste Confidence
Sent Date: 1/14/2014 7:46:55 AM
Received Date: 1/14/2014 7:46:56 AM
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	1/14/2014 7:46:56 AM
Comment of Corinne Carey.pdf	63104	

Options

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

December 19, 2013

Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001
ATTN: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff
Docket ID No. NRC-2012-0246

To: Secretary, Staff ; U.S. Congress, Government, Public and All:

[I assume that the above address in no way limits nor complicates my comments]

As a private citizen long concerned about nuclear power, particularly in Michigan but worldwide also, I have searched the "Waste Confidence Generic Environmental Impact Statement Draft Report for Comment " in vain for a simple, straight forward definition. Now I recall being at the NRC meeting long ago in Lansing, Michigan, where their discussion led to the decision to eliminate definitions as the most inexpensive and most effective [least responsible?] pathway to proceed in the development of nuclear power.

Therefore, my major comments will be on a seeming obfuscation via use of terms in a specific NRC fashion, in employing language all too often twisted from its normal uses.

For brevity, I shall quote only 2 dictionaries [Webster's II New Riverside and Larousse Spanish American Heritage]:

Webster's: confidence 1. Reliance on trust. 2. A trusting relationship. 3. A feeling of self-assurance. 4. The assurance that someone will keep a secret. 5. A secret

Next entry: confidence game - A swindle brought about by gaining the victim's confidence.

Larousse's: confianza [secret]; to place one's confidence in – confiar

Next: c. man: estafador

Clearly, this "Generic Environmental Impact" – "Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards is misnamed and misleading to the public and all.

I compare this misuse to the continuing use in this Draft and elsewhere of the term "spent", as in "spent fuel", which is so highly irradiated that it cannot continue in use at nuclear power plants, and which contains so many highly radioactive elements as to be non-disposable and permanently hazardous. I

cite the scientific half-life of Uranium 238 at 4.5 billion years [usually publicly referred to at much less storage/management need – information from early NRC reports].

Webster's: Spent – depleted of energy 2 exhausted

Larousse's: Spent – 1. Cf spend - spent (money); (time) pasar, dedicar; (force, anger) agotar, consumir; (to use) emplear

2. [consumed] gastado; [passed] acabado; [exhausted] agotado

The above definitions are language standards, the opposite from NRC uses, deliberately misleading and therefore unacceptable and revealing of NRC policies and principles.

I cite only these two among many others as examples.

My Comment: In all NRC language, use standard language definitions, not twists.

On page xxiii ES1 is titled "What is Waste Confidence?" gives NO definition, only "determination" and other references to the misleading "confidence". Included is "before final disposal in a permanent repository", and "continued storage", a situation proving impossible in the history of nuclear power.

My Comment: STOP MAKING IT !

CLEAN UP [ALSO IMPOSSIBLE!] THE EXISTING AND DAILY PRODUCING NUCLEAR WASTE !

On page xxx, the box states "NRC's concept of riskprobability....consequences.....HOW LIKELY IS IT...etc". Surely the facts of Hiroshima/Nagasaki, Three Mile Island [where setting a manageable fire was considered], Chernobyl [and its continuous wind-caused unexpected hotspots], and Fukushima on-going uncontrolled hazards.....etc.....sadly show the industry/NRC/etc. disrespect for human, environmental and planetary welfare.

My Comment: STOP MAKING IT!

CLEAN UP [ALSO IMPOSSIBLE] THE EXISTING AND DAILY PRODUCING NUCLEAR WASTE !

On page 1ii etc, repeatedly the draft states "Impacts would be SMALL."in the various sections and considerations. COMPARED TO WHAT ?????

On page 2-5, citing Decommissioning GEIS, the process of "storing spent fuel" is described as a delaying up to 60 years. This is an on-going threat to the sacrifice land as well as to the community of a standard 50 mile evacuation zone from Palisades – in which Grand Rapids [my family's homes] suburbs are included, but not the city itself. DOES THAT MEAN WE ARE SAFE IN AN EMERGENCY??? WHERE AND HOW DO WE ACQUIRE THAT INFORMATION ??? [it used to be in the telephone book].

On Page 2-16, in the discussion of dry cask use and description, WHY HAVE OUR INQUIRIES RESULTED IN INFORMATION THAT PALISADES NOW HAS BOTH VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL DRY CASKS IN USE? WHY?? WHAT ARE COMPARATIVE FACTS SHOWING OF SAFETY/PERMANENCE/REPLACEMENTS [100 YEARS....HOW, WITH CASK 4 STILL NOT REPLACED/RELOADED BECAUSE OF THE CRACK, OR OTHER ??

On page 8-8, in the discussion of "Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources" the Draft states "there would be no irreversible and irretrievable ... for most.....HOWEVER, IMPACTS ON LAND USE, AESTHETICS, HISTORIC AND CULTURALL RESOURCES, WASTE MANAGEMENT, AND TRANSPORTATION WOULD RESULT IN IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS....THE LOSS...IN PERPETUITY....IRREVERSIBLE COMMITMENT OF CAPACITY FOR WASTE DISPOSAL"

My Comment: DOES THIS MEAN ACCEPTANCE OF PERMANENTLY SACRIFICE LAND ON OUR PLANET ????

Additionally, I refer to the Draft Report length and page numeration which disguises repetitious materials, again at disadvantage to standard public uses.

Also on Page 10-1 Index, etc , there are no definitions in standard usage of terms.

My Comment: Despite the obvious extensive work and organization of Draft participants, I FIND , FOR THE ABOVE REASONS [AND MORE] THE CURRENT WASTE DRAFT UNACCEPTABLE.

Onward, in peacism,



Corinne Carey, G.R. Board Member of Don't Waste Michigan

2213 Riverside Dr. NE

Grand Rapids MI 49505