

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

| |
|---|
| As of: 1/8/18 3:56 PM Received: January 02, 2018 Status: Pending_Post Tracking No. 1k2-90pb-nnm7 Comments Due: January 02, 2018 Submission Type: Web |
|---|

Docket: NRC-2017-0211

Standard Review Plan for Spent Fuel Dry Storage Systems and Facilities

Comment On: NRC-2017-0211-0001

Standard Review Plan for Spent Fuel Dry Storage Systems and Facilities; Request for Comment on Draft NUREG

Document: NRC-2017-0211-DRAFT-0006

Comment on FR Doc # 2017-24734

(5)
11/15/2017
82 FR 52944

Submitter Information

Name: Gary Headrick

Address:

2837 Penasco

San Clemente, CA, 92673

Email: gary@sanclementegreen.org

General Comment

As Co-founder of San Clemente Green and representative of over 5,000 concerned local citizens, I wish to endorse the document submitted by Donna Gilmore of SanOnofreSafety.org, attached. I am also attaching the comments I gathered in a recent petition that was sent to the California Coastal Commission. Out of 1051 signatures there are over 400 comments from ordinary people who spoke from their heart about their concerns over storing nuclear waste on our coast. The CCC dismissed those concerns for lacking authority over radiation matters and said they should be redirected to the NRC, so please take these into the record as well.

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM - 013

E-RIDS= ADM -03

Add= Jeremy Smith (jass)

Attachments

Comments to NUREG-2215Gilmore2018-01-02

Petition to revoke permit

Date: January 2, 2018

Comments to NRC Docket ID NRC-2017-0211, NUREG-2215

NRC Standard Review Plan for Spent Fuel Dry Storage Systems and Facilities Draft, November 2017

<https://www.nrc.gov/docs/ML1731/ML17310A693.pdf>

The NRC cannot meet its mission to “ensure adequate protection of public health and safety and the environment” if it continues to allow thin-wall welded canisters they admit are vulnerable to cracks, that cannot be fully inspected (inside or out), and cannot be repaired, maintained and monitored to prevent (not just detect) radiological leaks. There is no adequate or proven detailed plan required to address major radiological leaks, or to address on-site replacement of containers. Seismic requirements for partial cracks is not addressed. See below webpage for details on the Holtec UMAX System planned for San Onofre and why this is an example of a system with major problems that should not be approved.
<https://sanonofresafety.org/holtec-hi-storm-umax-nuclear-waste-dry-storage-system/>

Each canister contains about as much or more lethal Cesium-137 as released from the 1986 Chernobyl nuclear disaster, yet the NRC knows the boron metal in the canisters will not prevent the fuel from going critical if exposed to non-borated water from through wall cracks (in storage or transport).

NUREG-2215 states it requires “conservative assumptions”, “inspections”, and admits to many “unknowns”. NUREG-2215 is not “conservative”, does not require adequate “inspections”, and does not resolve the many “unknowns” that would be eliminated if the NRC mandated and enforced critical safety requirements to inspect, monitor, maintain and repair (both inside and out) to PREVENT leaks.

Proven dry storage technology exists that meets critical basic safety requirements we expect in a car. Does the NRC consider thin-wall canisters “conservative assumptions” compared to thick-wall casks? If so, why? Why does the NRC allow containers that do not meet these basic critical safety requirements?

Respectfully,

Donna Gilmore, SanOnofreSafety.org
donnagilmore@gmail.com 949-204-7794

| Basic Safety Requirements | Thin-wall canisters | Thick-wall casks |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Thick walls | No. Only 1/2 to 5/8 th of an inch | Yes. 10 to 19.75 inches |
| Won't crack. | No | Yes |
| Ability to inspect inside & out, maintain, repair (fuel baskets, other parts) | No | Yes |
| Monitor to fix problems <i>before</i> leaks | No | Yes |
| ASME <i>container</i> certification | No | Yes |
| Defense in depth (redundancy) | No | Yes |
| Stored in concrete building | No | Yes |
| Gamma & neutron protection | Requires vented concrete overpack | Yes |
| Transportable | No transport with cracks. 10 CFR § 71.85 | Yes |
| Proven technology | No. Conditions unknown. Most in use less than 15 yrs, a few 30 yrs. | Yes. Inspected and used over 40 years |



This petition has collected
1051 signatures
using the online tools at iPetitions.com

Printed on 2017-11-06

REVOKE Nuclear Waste Storage Permit at San Onofre

About this petition

Your signature on this Petition will send a message, loud and clear to the California Coastal Commission that the permit they approved for Edison was flawed and must be revoked. The Special Conditions in the Coastal Permit that are twenty years out are well intended, but should have been required from the start. Other countries currently use nuclear waste storage systems that could meet those reasonable requirements today. Their containers can be inspected, repaired, maintained, monitored and transported without cracks. The thin canisters being used at San Onofre have none of these attributes because they were only intended for temporary storage.

Signatures

1. Name: Craig Beauchamp on 2017-10-06 17:02:26
Comments: No storage in populated areas. It's a reckless disregard for human life.
Revoke!

2. Name: Ed Schlegel on 2017-10-06 20:53:54
Comments:

3. Name: Laurie Headrick on 2017-10-07 20:48:50
Comments: Stop this insane plan to bury nuclear waste in temporary storage containers on our beach! There are better alternatives.

4. Name: Gary Headrick on 2017-10-10 19:19:50
Comments:

5. Name: tiffany galaway on 2017-10-10 22:53:05
Comments:

6. Name: Rose Marie Leather on 2017-10-10 22:53:28
Comments:

7. Name: Sharon Swan on 2017-10-10 22:53:43
Comments:

8. Name: Cristina León on 2017-10-10 22:53:55
Comments:

9. Name: Debbie Naude on 2017-10-10 22:54:43
Comments:

10. Name: Brig Jorgensen on 2017-10-10 22:55:39
Comments: Ship it out and bury it deep NM or TX where the local want the crap. Get it off the coast!

11. Name: James Mulcare on 2017-10-10 22:55:45
Comments:

12. Name: Jody Gibson on 2017-10-10 22:55:56
Comments:

13. Name: Mark Reback on 2017-10-10 22:56:22
Comments: No nuclear waste right next to the ocean! Are you nuts?

-
14. Name: Aparna Bakhle on 2017-10-10 22:57:05
Comments:
-
15. Name: Rob Gordon on 2017-10-10 22:57:41
Comments:
-
16. Name: Michael Metcalf on 2017-10-10 22:58:18
Comments:
-
17. Name: Lee Grimes Evans on 2017-10-10 22:58:57
Comments:
-
18. Name: Denise Liebmann on 2017-10-10 22:59:06
Comments: Let the CCC bury this toxin in their own backyards.
-
19. Name: Mehrak Kanani on 2017-10-10 23:01:49
Comments:
-
20. Name: Janet Way on 2017-10-10 23:02:22
Comments:
-
21. Name: Charles Murray on 2017-10-10 23:02:43
Comments: NIOBY !
-
22. Name: Carroll Arkema on 2017-10-10 23:02:58
Comments:
-
23. Name: Phoebe Sorgen on 2017-10-10 23:03:27
Comments: Please wake up to sanity, or do you prefer a Ca Fukushima style nightmare?
-
24. Name: Barbara Fox on 2017-10-10 23:03:43
Comments: I consider the burial of nuclear waste at this site to be one of the biggest travesties in history. I have no intention of standing down and letting this just happen.

The public cares. I care.
-
25. Name: Marvin Dennis on 2017-10-10 23:03:45
Comments: It's a crazy notion to believe these casters would provide an adequate level of protection for any significant period of time. Don't let this happen. Revoke the permit now and insist on a better plan.
-

26. Name: Curtis McLendon on 2017-10-10 23:04:39
Comments:
-
27. Name: Elizabeth McLendon on 2017-10-10 23:05:19
Comments:
-
28. Name: Elisa Crawford on 2017-10-10 23:05:35
Comments:
-
29. Name: Susan Sayre on 2017-10-10 23:07:20
Comments: The nuclear waste is not safely stored at San Onofre and will never be. It must be stored at a location far from earthquake faults and far from the ocean.
-
30. Name: J T Smith on 2017-10-10 23:07:27
Comments:
-
31. Name: Mary Tilton on 2017-10-10 23:10:56
Comments:
-
32. Name: Lorna Farnum on 2017-10-10 23:11:19
Comments: Putting the nuclear waste so close to the ocean on an earthquake fault line is to ask for another Fukushima accident to occur in a much more densely populated area. It is recklessness for MILLIONS of CALIFORNIANS living within 12 of the San Onofre site.
-
33. Name: Bob Miller on 2017-10-10 23:11:51
Comments: I previously lived only a few miles from San Onofre.
-
34. Name: Sandra McCanne on 2017-10-10 23:12:09
Comments:
-
35. Name: Rachel Clark on 2017-10-10 23:12:31
Comments: You must be kidding!
-
36. Name: Michael Tomczyszyn on 2017-10-10 23:14:53
Comments:
-
37. Name: Alan Lawrence on 2017-10-10 23:18:08
Comments: We need to avoid another Fukushima.
-
38. Name: Margaret Elliott on 2017-10-10 23:18:36
Comments:
-

39. Name: Jessica Cresseveur on 2017-10-10 23:19:21
Comments:
-
40. Name: Gary Bandfield on 2017-10-10 23:19:22
Comments:
-
41. Name: Meryle A Korn on 2017-10-10 23:19:59
Comments: The San Onofre reactor should never have been permitted in the first place. Fukushima showed the world that an earthquake and tsunami zone is totally unsafe. A plan to store nuclear waste there is at least as ill-founded as the original reactor, and for the same reasons.
-
42. Name: Verna Rollinger on 2017-10-10 23:20:52
Comments: We need thick-wall casks
-
43. Name: Veloma M Scott on 2017-10-10 23:21:32
Comments:
-
44. Name: Julia Cato on 2017-10-10 23:25:19
Comments:
-
45. Name: Ed Schlegel on 2017-10-10 23:25:29
Comments:
-
46. Name: Peter Butt on 2017-10-10 23:29:15
Comments: The attempts to evade responsibility for the SONGS nuclear dilemma continue apace. SCE et al are responsible and liable for their waste. I'm responsible for mine. What about them?
-
47. Name: William Klock on 2017-10-10 23:29:39
Comments:
-
48. Name: Susan Goggins on 2017-10-10 23:32:21
Comments: This has to be one of the worst places to bury hazardous, nuclear waste. CCC, please revoke this permit.
-
49. Name: Cheryl Moe on 2017-10-10 23:34:10
Comments: Please do not approve this. This has the greatest effect on the public coastal resources and public health. So many young people in this area have cancer. If you approve this then there is no reason for CCC to scrutinize single family residential projects. Those are insignificant. Please focus on the big picture. This will be disastrous. Vote NO.
-
50. Name: Ellen Lubic on 2017-10-10 23:34:31

Comments:

-
51. Name: Linda Pyle on 2017-10-10 23:34:53
Comments:
-
52. Name: Todd Furuike on 2017-10-10 23:36:18
Comments: Please revoke the permit to have SONGS bury nuclear waste at San Onofre
-
53. Name: DH Higgins on 2017-10-10 23:36:40
Comments:
-
54. Name: Cody Dolnick on 2017-10-10 23:36:42
Comments:
-
55. Name: Frances Howard on 2017-10-10 23:36:52
Comments: This is not a safe place to store nuclear waste, we must find another site!
-
56. Name: Lisa Hammermeister on 2017-10-10 23:37:02
Comments: In earthquake country, NO nuclear storage!
-
57. Name: LAURA ROSS on 2017-10-10 23:38:30
Comments:
-
58. Name: David Reilly on 2017-10-10 23:38:33
Comments: No nukes ever. Bury this shit under congress and in the back yard of every energy executive.
-
59. Name: Peter Stone on 2017-10-10 23:39:22
Comments:
-
60. Name: David E Haycraft on 2017-10-10 23:39:37
Comments:
-
61. Name: Kim Atkinson on 2017-10-10 23:41:40
Comments: It would be insane to permit nuclear waste storage like this.
-
62. Name: Eva meier on 2017-10-10 23:42:34
Comments:
-
63. Name: Patricia Baley on 2017-10-10 23:42:47
Comments:
-

64. Name: Amy Steinberg on 2017-10-10 23:42:48
Comments:
-
65. Name: Jim powers on 2017-10-10 23:48:52
Comments: We need a better plan. The cheap and easy plan now will cost much more later.
-
66. Name: Michelle Veyna on 2017-10-10 23:51:00
Comments:
-
67. Name: Joseph Cope on 2017-10-10 23:53:02
Comments:
-
68. Name: Linda Pierce on 2017-10-10 23:54:06
Comments: This is too close to too many,!
-
69. Name: Shivam Kohls on 2017-10-10 23:54:24
Comments:
-
70. Name: Tanya Barach on 2017-10-10 23:54:58
Comments: Please take responsibility and end this nightmare scenario before it begins. There is a better way!!!
-
71. Name: Judy Genandt on 2017-10-10 23:56:38
Comments:
-
72. Name: Kim F Floyd on 2017-10-10 23:56:45
Comments:
-
73. Name: Nikki Alexander on 2017-10-10 23:59:50
Comments: Could we think about what's best for the planet, for once?
-
74. Name: Morris Sandel on 2017-10-11 00:00:41
Comments: Better still STOP PRODUCING NUCLEAR WASTE!!! -Morris Sandel
-
75. Name: joe sain on 2017-10-11 00:03:30
Comments:
-
76. Name: Kent Minault on 2017-10-11 00:03:36
Comments:
-
77. Name: Shari Horne on 2017-10-11 00:04:25

Comments: This is the worst environment possible for this waste.

-
78. Name: Christine Goodhue on 2017-10-11 00:05:27
Comments: Please be responsible! This negligence affects all of us in Southern California.
-
79. Name: Anne Dugaw on 2017-10-11 00:06:39
Comments:
-
80. Name: Leslie Cassidy on 2017-10-11 00:06:52
Comments:
-
81. Name: alan papsun on 2017-10-11 00:06:52
Comments:
-
82. Name: Patricia Wines on 2017-10-11 00:08:32
Comments: Nothing about the storage of this nuclear waste will be "temporary" as in an interim short-term solution to be resolved in my life time so let's at least use an appropriate container that can be transported, monitored and is as safe as possible for this "temporary" location.
-
83. Name: Jacquelyn Earnest on 2017-10-11 00:12:01
Comments:
-
84. Name: Michelle Miranda on 2017-10-11 00:16:12
Comments:
-
85. Name: Elise Kert on 2017-10-11 00:19:20
Comments:
-
86. Name: Josephine Hill on 2017-10-11 00:22:13
Comments: With increased technological knowledge about nuclear wastes, our regulatory agencies need to update their knowledge to maximize the effectiveness of their job description of protecting the public health.
-
87. Name: Marilyn Miller on 2017-10-11 00:24:24
Comments: Please keep us safe!
-
88. Name: Simone Schad Siebert on 2017-10-11 00:28:21
Comments: This is not a safe option! No nuclear waste at San Onofre.
-
89. Name: Darrell Clarke on 2017-10-11 00:29:06
Comments:

-
90. Name: Gerry Martocci on 2017-10-11 00:31:12
Comments:
-
91. Name: Diana Nolan on 2017-10-11 00:35:43
Comments: Please do not put our citizens, ocean and environment at risk with a short sighted potentially catastrophic , flawed storage system.
-
92. Name: Brian Smith on 2017-10-11 00:38:11
Comments:
-
93. Name: Skip Shaputnic on 2017-10-11 00:42:38
Comments:
-
94. Name: Joseph Shulman on 2017-10-11 00:43:46
Comments:
-
95. Name: Joseph M Tully on 2017-10-11 00:46:59
Comments: Remove all stores uranium to a federally secured site designed for long term storage.
-
96. Name: Terry Albrecht on 2017-10-11 00:47:48
Comments:
-
97. Name: david bardwick on 2017-10-11 00:48:50
Comments:
-
98. Name: christopher ericson on 2017-10-11 00:52:43
Comments:
-
99. Name: Sylvia Ruth Gray on 2017-10-11 00:53:03
Comments: This is an accident waiting to happen.
-
100. Name: Tom Arntson on 2017-10-11 00:53:26
Comments: Isn't there a BETTER option?
-
101. Name: Evie Kosower on 2017-10-11 00:53:29
Comments:
-
102. Name: nora jaffe on 2017-10-11 00:56:23
Comments: It is unconscionable that this permit was granted because it defies common sense. Please revoke it and find a better way.

-
103. Name: helgaleena on 2017-10-11 00:59:21
Comments:
-
104. Name: John Zimmermann on 2017-10-11 01:02:03
Comments:
-
105. Name: Charles Langley on 2017-10-11 01:14:12
Comments: There is such a cloud of controversy and public suspicion about the way the original permit was issued that it behooves the Commission to restore trust by suspending the permit until a proper vote and an informed public discussion can occur.
-
106. Name: Kimberly Wiley on 2017-10-11 01:16:03
Comments:
-
107. Name: Brent Rocks on 2017-10-11 01:31:22
Comments:
-
108. Name: henry moser on 2017-10-11 01:32:52
Comments:
-
109. Name: Jennifer on 2017-10-11 01:39:47
Comments:
-
110. Name: tye block on 2017-10-11 01:41:32
Comments:
-
111. Name: Sally Barron on 2017-10-11 01:56:56
Comments: The current permit is flawed and must be revoked. The lives of thousands of Californians depend on it,
-
112. Name: Susan Wingfield-Ritter on 2017-10-11 02:03:43
Comments: Thin-wall canisters are too dangerous to allow. Please act accordingly.
-
113. Name: Liz Kuhns on 2017-10-11 02:09:20
Comments: Why put lives and the future at risk? If safer storage is available, what is the reason for not choosing it?
-
114. Name: Rebecca Davis on 2017-10-11 02:11:39
Comments:
-

115. Name: nancymcdonell on 2017-10-11 02:14:57
Comments:
-
116. Name: sundra allen on 2017-10-11 02:15:34
Comments:
-
117. Name: Cris Fulton on 2017-10-11 02:21:22
Comments:
-
118. Name: Barbara Takashima on 2017-10-11 02:28:05
Comments:
-
119. Name: Mary Krut on 2017-10-11 02:30:39
Comments:
-
120. Name: peter taft on 2017-10-11 02:31:33
Comments:
-
121. Name: JoAnne Gervase on 2017-10-11 02:32:10
Comments: Please do not allow the radioactive waste at San Onofre to be buried near the ocean. Thank you
-
122. Name: Richard L Ellison on 2017-10-11 02:33:02
Comments:
-
123. Name: Linda on 2017-10-11 02:39:20
Comments:
-
124. Name: Don McKelvey on 2017-10-11 02:45:04
Comments: This is a no-brainer !
-
125. Name: Laurenn Barker on 2017-10-11 02:46:08
Comments: Please revoke the petition that was approved for this storage as it was improperly granted based on current knowledge and industry standards.
-
126. Name: Richard and Judy Northrop on 2017-10-11 02:49:50
Comments: This plan is absurd and dangerous!
-
127. Name: Len Willie on 2017-10-11 02:55:05
Comments:
-
128. Name: Jerry Malamud on 2017-10-11 02:57:46

Comments:

-
129. Name: Devon Azzam on 2017-10-11 03:00:50
Comments:
-
130. Name: Prisca Gloor on 2017-10-11 03:00:58
Comments: Please save lives and nature and don't store nuclear waste near the ocean.
-
131. Name: Glenn Frieder on 2017-10-11 03:15:21
Comments: Too dangerous with our being on a earth quake fault
-
132. Name: Kay Ospital on 2017-10-11 03:24:54
Comments:
-
133. Name: CAROL COLLINS on 2017-10-11 03:30:26
Comments:
-
134. Name: Janice Burstin on 2017-10-11 03:52:20
Comments: IT'S MUCH TOO RISKY TO BURY NUCLEAR WASTE AT SAN ONOFRE IN UNSAFE CANNISTERS!! THIS IS NOT AN EXPERIMENT...WE ARE NOT GUINEA PIGS!!
-
135. Name: Mha Atma S Khalsa on 2017-10-11 03:53:13
Comments:
-
136. Name: Peter Giannola on 2017-10-11 03:53:16
Comments: Nuclear waste is the most serious environmental problem now facing us. It's our responsibility to future generations solve this problem.
-
137. Name: VINCENT E STIPA on 2017-10-11 03:55:29
Comments:
-
138. Name: Wendy Morris on 2017-10-11 04:09:25
Comments: How could you approve this? It is too dangerous to transport or to store in yucca mountain. But ok to bury next to the ocean and state park in this highly populated area. That doesn't make sense.
-
139. Name: dorothy varellas on 2017-10-11 04:11:32
Comments: Are you kidding? Doesn't anyone remember what happened at Fukushima? Doesn't anyone on the CCC know that we live on earthquake faults? Storing nuclear waste at Son Onofre on the edge of the ocean is the most stupid idea I have ever heard of, short of building Diablo Canyon on the oceans edge!

You are playing with fire and the lives of millions of people are in jeopardy. Get real and

do not authorize this terrible plan.

140. Name: Edith Ogella on 2017-10-11 04:17:33
Comments:

141. Name: Georgette Korsen on 2017-10-11 04:20:55
Comments: This is an outrageous decision that is not in the best interest of any of the 65,000 people who live in San Clemente, nor any of the hundreds of thousands that live further north or south. We have lived with those nuclear plants for years, dreading an accident or release of radiation. NOW is the time to finally keep us safe, out of harms way. PLEASE, do not store those casks on site, in harms way. PLEASE.

142. Name: John Leddy on 2017-10-11 04:27:24
Comments: Is the CCC still protecting our coast? That has been in doubt of late. The EPA and NRC are definitely hostiles. BACT is a must for decommissioning dirty nukes. CCC, do your job!

143. Name: Sharlene Bergart on 2017-10-11 04:27:44
Comments: Nuclear Waste Storage permit must be revoked. It is seriously flawed and dangerous for people and animals living nearby. It is also dangerous for the ocean. Stop this permit now.

144. Name: lisa uhrhammer on 2017-10-11 04:29:59
Comments: DO NOT LET THIS HAPPEN! THIS IS A PRIVATE COMPANY AND THE STOCKHOLDERS SHOULD PAY THE EXPENSE OF REMOVING THE NUCLEAR WASTE AND TAKING IT TO STORE IT FOR PERPETUITY. THE STOCKHOLDERS MADE MONEY AND NOW MUST FOOT THE BILL!!

145. Name: Cathy Asciutto on 2017-10-11 04:39:15
Comments:

146. Name: Jim Wells on 2017-10-11 04:40:35
Comments: What is the diplomatic way to say "What the fk was wrong with whomever of you voted before to approve the current permit for Southern California Edison to to store nuclear waste at their San Onofre site?" ? Regardless, that all of you should now revoke it is beyond question.

147. Name: Katherine James on 2017-10-11 04:40:36
Comments:

148. Name: Jeb Pronto on 2017-10-11 04:44:27
Comments:

149. Name: Daniel Headrick MD on 2017-10-11 04:45:09

-
150. Name: Stephen Joseph Libert on 2017-10-11 04:47:32
Comments: PLEASE! Find a better way.
-
151. Name: Duff Wilmoth on 2017-10-11 05:03:40
Comments: You have a nuclear reactor situated on the beach along the Pacific Ocean. Please fulfill your civic duty to Orange County, the ST CA and the charter you are mandated uphold to and be on the right side of history. .
-
152. Name: Edeltraut Renk on 2017-10-11 05:15:10
Comments:
-
153. Name: Grace van Thillo on 2017-10-11 05:18:59
Comments: The permit to store nuclear waste at SoCal Edison's San Onofre Nuclear Plant should be revoked. 8.5 million people live in the southland. Property and business values are some of the state/nation's highest. USMC Camp Pendleton is our nation's primary military base. Major north/south rail and transportation corridors pass by the stored waste. Any radioactive accident will be disastrous to human and all life and the area's land and ocean environment, and the economic viability of both state and nation. Present storage casks are not tested for long-term storage. The NRC doesn't know what to expect! The highest grade, safest storage should be employed; and when safe to do so, with viable locations, the nuclear waste should be removed; not stored in San Onofre, until a natural disaster, earthquake and tsunami happen.
-
154. Name: Carol H on 2017-10-11 05:27:56
Comments:
-
155. Name: Yoko Collin on 2017-10-11 05:41:51
Comments:
-
156. Name: Jill Estensen on 2017-10-11 05:41:59
Comments: Nuclear power without appropriate waste containment is irresponsibility in it's worst form, greed.
-
157. Name: Madge Torres on 2017-10-11 06:09:47
Comments:
-
158. Name: Michael Robert Gonzalez on 2017-10-11 06:10:07
Comments:
-
159. Name: Corey E Olsen on 2017-10-11 06:26:12
Comments:
-

160. Name: Barbara R Chavez-Rock on 2017-10-11 06:35:25
Comments:
-
161. Name: Jeanne Green on 2017-10-11 07:17:15
Comments: Inadequate storage is unacceptable. Only Thick-wall casks be used as in other civilized countries.. Revoke storage permit at San Onofre.
-
162. Name: Kay Gallin on 2017-10-11 07:31:35
Comments:
-
163. Name: Mary Pat Eberle on 2017-10-11 07:55:38
Comments:
-
164. Name: eugene burke on 2017-10-11 07:58:30
Comments:
-
165. Name: Sherry Johnson on 2017-10-11 08:02:12
Comments:
-
166. Name: Katherine Jorgensen on 2017-10-11 09:16:26
Comments: San Onofre has long been a source of apprehension especially in the event of a major earthquake and now in terms of North Korea's and Trump's bombastic threats
-
167. Name: Rita Conn on 2017-10-11 10:18:56
Comments:
-
168. Name: joe overmyer on 2017-10-11 12:32:58
Comments:
-
169. Name: Deborah Drucker on 2017-10-11 12:43:09
Comments:
-
170. Name: Jerome Kirsling on 2017-10-11 12:50:36
Comments: This is a mater of not only environmental protection but of protecting the people of the United States and the globe. We cannot afford to be careless with this dangerous an issue!
-
171. Name: Jerome Kirsling on 2017-10-11 12:51:07
Comments: This is a mater of not only environmental protection but of protecting the people of the United States and the globe. We cannot afford to be careless with this dangerous an issue!
-
172. Name: Lori Mulvey on 2017-10-11 12:54:12

Comments:

-
173. Name: Chris Connolly on 2017-10-11 12:54:35
Comments: Please make Edison treat this Nuclear waste LIKE Nuclear waste, not take the cheap way out and bury it near our most precious resource, the Pacific Ocean!
-
174. Name: Kathleen Connolly on 2017-10-11 12:55:39
Comments:
-
175. Name: Gale Darling on 2017-10-11 12:59:05
Comments:
-
176. Name: Bruce Campbell on 2017-10-11 12:59:48
Comments: At the CEP meeting when the CCC voted for a radwaste configuration on San Onofre State Beach, Dr. Singh of the Holtec Co. admitted that his company's nuclear waste canisters cannot be monitored, repackaged, or transported.
- Thus, it is highly likely that any such configuration would become permanent -- unless a number of safety regulations are waived to allow some sort of repackaging and transport!
-
177. Name: john nicksic on 2017-10-11 13:27:00
Comments:
-
178. Name: Pam Evans on 2017-10-11 13:34:16
Comments:
-
179. Name: Lisa Goff on 2017-10-11 13:40:26
Comments: no nuclear waster here!
-
180. Name: Rebecca Robles on 2017-10-11 13:47:21
Comments:
-
181. Name: Rachael Mitchell on 2017-10-11 13:56:00
Comments:
-
182. Name: Beckee Cost on 2017-10-11 14:12:42
Comments: This is completely unacceptable!
-
183. Name: Kelly Wilson on 2017-10-11 14:18:55
Comments:
-
184. Name: Rebecca Noble-Kibby on 2017-10-11 14:19:13
Comments:

-
185. Name: Lisa Tart on 2017-10-11 14:38:43
Comments: How udderly insane to even think about doing this project
-
186. Name: Lisa Kopelman on 2017-10-11 14:45:05
Comments: I'm a long time resident of San Clemente and vehemently oppose the plan to bury the waste at San Onofre.
-
187. Name: Gail Cohn on 2017-10-11 14:47:16
Comments:
-
188. Name: Andrew Ellis on 2017-10-11 14:52:53
Comments: SCE's aging mangement plan that allows inspection of only 50% of the lower half of the spent fuel canisters is a recipe for disaster. An inspection plan that covers only half of the surface area of the canisters will not be able to detect radiation leaks from the San Onofre Storage facility.
-
189. Name: Elizabeth Lerer on 2017-10-11 14:53:04
Comments: Please Coastal Commission, prove you are being true to your mission, "The Commission is committed to protecting and enhancing California's coast and ocean for present and future generations."

Find a better way to protect the coast. Please REVOKE the nuclear waste storage permit at San Onofre.
-
190. Name: Erik Husoe on 2017-10-11 14:53:05
Comments:
-
191. Name: Joseph R Thompson on 2017-10-11 15:03:28
Comments:
-
192. Name: Patti herdell on 2017-10-11 15:14:19
Comments:
-
193. Name: Phyllis Jordanov on 2017-10-11 15:26:28
Comments:
-
194. Name: Michele Pellissier on 2017-10-11 15:32:36
Comments:
-
195. Name: Michelle Schumacher on 2017-10-11 15:36:03
Comments:
-

196. Name: Bill Fickling on 2017-10-11 15:48:10
Comments:
-
197. Name: Trevor Bryson on 2017-10-11 15:54:58
Comments: This is simply put a stupid idea!!
-
198. Name: Robert Lieber on 2017-10-11 16:02:56
Comments:
-
199. Name: Robert Lieber on 2017-10-11 16:05:12
Comments:
-
200. Name: Lucaccioni Jana on 2017-10-11 16:09:27
Comments:
-
201. Name: adriana johnson on 2017-10-11 16:18:36
Comments:
-
202. Name: Joanna Mathews on 2017-10-11 16:20:13
Comments: Move the waste away from the ocean. This is a disaster waiting to happen. Time for the government and utilities to accept responsibility. If nuclear plants were built and even still operating, there should be safe disposal sites built. 50+ years of waiting and doing nothing in terms of disposal is unacceptable to the health and future of our citizens.
-
203. Name: Petti Van Rekom on 2017-10-11 16:20:17
Comments: My family has lived in San Clemente for over 50 years. The threat of a disaster from nuclear waste is a threat to our safety and well being. Please do NOT let Edison continue to store the waste at San Onofre.
-
204. Name: Judy Lopez on 2017-10-11 16:26:26
Comments: Must be prevented to bury in ocean, NOT acceptable!!
-
205. Name: Shirley Michael on 2017-10-11 16:32:29
Comments:
-
206. Name: Ron May Jr on 2017-10-11 16:34:24
Comments:
-
207. Name: Sarah on 2017-10-11 16:36:01
Comments:
-
208. Name: Caryn Graves on 2017-10-11 16:49:56

Comments:

209. Name: Belinda Robnett-Olsen on 2017-10-11 16:51:03
Comments:

210. Name: Armen Gasparian on 2017-10-11 16:56:05
Comments: Stop the madness.

211. Name: Nancy Princetta on 2017-10-11 16:57:40
Comments: Have we not learned anything from the disaster at Fukushima, Japan? Nuclear waste planted by water sources, our oceans and highly in inhabited densely populated areas is an UNACCEPABLE, highly DANGEROUS AND puts our quality of life at great risk.

212. Name: Nina Macdonald on 2017-10-11 16:59:23
Comments:

213. Name: Mike Craig on 2017-10-11 17:01:33
Comments:

214. Name: Daniel Driscoll on 2017-10-11 17:13:58
Comments: Nuclear waste near our beautiful beaches is not something to 'cut corners' on

215. Name: Claudia Pineda on 2017-10-11 17:15:51
Comments:

216. Name: robynn zender on 2017-10-11 17:16:29
Comments:

217. Name: Susan Morrissey on 2017-10-11 17:29:16
Comments:

218. Name: Brenda Cohn on 2017-10-11 17:34:14
Comments:

219. Name: Carolyn Yvellez on 2017-10-11 17:42:27
Comments: Keep San Diego/Oceanside safe and healthy!

220. Name: Susan Anderson on 2017-10-11 17:46:15
Comments:

221. Name: Richard Sauerheber on 2017-10-11 17:56:20

Comments:

-
222. Name: Linda Hodges on 2017-10-11 17:58:14
Comments:
-
223. Name: Pauline Yahr on 2017-10-11 17:59:19
Comments:
-
224. Name: William Crane on 2017-10-11 18:00:04
Comments: Putting nuclear waste so close to the ocean is a very BAD idea.
-
225. Name: Estee on 2017-10-11 18:06:36
Comments:
-
226. Name: Janet Pritchard on 2017-10-11 18:11:22
Comments:
-
227. Name: Cynthia Lakon on 2017-10-11 18:39:22
Comments: We must find a much safer solution for the storage of these nuclear wastes.
-
228. Name: Schwab Gabriele on 2017-10-11 18:48:33
Comments: Burying the waste at this site would be a disaster. There must be a better solution!! The consequences might be catastrophic. Those responsible should learn from history!
-
229. Name: Lucía Cash on 2017-10-11 19:10:19
Comments:
-
230. Name: Gary Miller on 2017-10-11 19:19:51
Comments:
-
231. Name: Ernest Simonin on 2017-10-11 19:28:07
Comments:
-
232. Name: Barbara Cohn on 2017-10-11 19:31:20
Comments:
-
233. Name: Julie Brown on 2017-10-11 19:34:27
Comments:
-
234. Name: Christine Shields on 2017-10-11 20:10:37
Comments: Stop this madness

-
235. Name: Shell Lavender on 2017-10-11 20:17:53
Comments: California is already suffering massive irradiation from Fukushima. They don't need the possibility of more.
-
236. Name: MC Hagerty on 2017-10-11 20:17:54
Comments: Its crazy that the "Officials" think it is OK to bury nuclear waste near the ocean, and all the earthquake faults in the area. They must not live in SoCal or they would not do this!
-
237. Name: Jill scherillo on 2017-10-11 20:19:10
Comments:
-
238. Name: Shahrokh Mirjahangir on 2017-10-11 20:29:22
Comments: Permit must be revoked.
This is point of no return.
Common sense has to prevail.

Thank you
-
239. Name: Patricia Martz on 2017-10-11 20:59:50
Comments: Do not store nuclear waste at San Onofre. It is too dangerous.
-
240. Name: Michael Epeneter on 2017-10-11 21:29:45
Comments: I implore the California Coastal Commission to revoke or at minimum suspend the Nuclear Waste Storage Permit at San Onofre. We need a better plan to deal with this waste product and one that insures the safety of our community.
-
241. Name: Patricia Plumb on 2017-10-11 21:36:28
Comments:
-
242. Name: Chris Bauman on 2017-10-11 21:36:32
Comments:
-
243. Name: Iris Edinger on 2017-10-11 21:52:52
Comments:
-
244. Name: Dina Falmagne on 2017-10-11 22:01:17
Comments:
-
245. Name: Gary T Jenkins on 2017-10-11 22:10:00
Comments:
-

246. Name: Meredith Ann Riekse on 2017-10-11 22:10:25
Comments:
-
247. Name: Beth Anderson on 2017-10-11 22:19:26
Comments:
-
248. Name: Monica Fuerst Finkelstein on 2017-10-11 22:21:07
Comments: Everyone's lives are important including the individuals not born yet.
-
249. Name: Chuck Hoblitzelle on 2017-10-11 22:36:21
Comments:
-
250. Name: Beth Brokaw on 2017-10-11 22:44:50
Comments: Please do the right thing. Protect us now and not 2 decades from now. This is a serious issue demanding timely action.
Thank you.
-
251. Name: T Bell on 2017-10-11 22:45:31
Comments: Unsafe in any Place !
Stop the Madness !
-
252. Name: Barbara Howard on 2017-10-11 23:03:19
Comments:
-
253. Name: Christina Carroll on 2017-10-11 23:09:08
Comments:
-
254. Name: Monica Andersen on 2017-10-11 23:11:14
Comments:
-
255. Name: Vincent price on 2017-10-11 23:22:29
Comments:
-
256. Name: Dede Newman on 2017-10-11 23:56:16
Comments:
-
257. Name: Virginia Timmins on 2017-10-12 00:01:37
Comments: My family lives there and I would consider moving close to them in the future. This decision could change my mind.
It is a thoughtlessly proposed option. If other countries can do better so can we. Do what is best for the people and not make it an economic issue.
-
258. Name: Dave Kisor on 2017-10-12 00:28:27

Comments: Whoever decided to use the thin wall casks should be beaten until their morale improves.

259. Name: Janelle Dodkin on 2017-10-12 00:36:28
Comments:

260. Name: Kelley Scanlon on 2017-10-12 01:07:12
Comments:

261. Name: Charles Constance on 2017-10-12 01:10:06
Comments:

262. Name: Bill Hedrick on 2017-10-12 01:30:08
Comments:

263. Name: Cheryl Harding on 2017-10-12 01:38:52
Comments:

264. Name: Annette Schlichter on 2017-10-12 02:28:44
Comments:

265. Name: Nola Wood on 2017-10-12 02:40:54
Comments:

266. Name: Libbe HaLevy on 2017-10-12 02:46:09
Comments:

267. Name: Lisa Cairo on 2017-10-12 02:55:44
Comments:

268. Name: senait forthal on 2017-10-12 03:32:04
Comments:

269. Name: Dennis Trembly on 2017-10-12 04:47:20
Comments:

270. Name: Pamela horowitz on 2017-10-12 04:49:50
Comments:

271. Name: Ann Bron on 2017-10-12 04:54:38
Comments:

272. Name: L Read on 2017-10-12 04:58:13
Comments: Store that nuke waste at Yucca Mountain--not in a heavily populated coastal city. You dumbasses are asking for another Fukushima if California gets a significant earthquake. Don't be stupid!
-
273. Name: Cris Mazza on 2017-10-12 11:04:14
Comments:
-
274. Name: nate headrick on 2017-10-12 12:09:16
Comments:
-
275. Name: Grant Bruso on 2017-10-12 12:59:02
Comments:
-
276. Name: Eleanor Fumanti on 2017-10-12 13:32:07
Comments:
-
277. Name: priscilla agnew on 2017-10-12 13:35:14
Comments:
-
278. Name: Swedina Hurt on 2017-10-12 13:49:29
Comments:
-
279. Name: Barbara Froehlich on 2017-10-12 16:01:03
Comments:
-
280. Name: S Stoneman on 2017-10-12 20:42:53
Comments:
-
281. Name: Dave Tallman on 2017-10-12 21:04:56
Comments:
-
282. Name: Gail Tallman on 2017-10-12 21:07:16
Comments:
-
283. Name: Marian Farber on 2017-10-12 21:21:47
Comments: NO< NO--too close to a LARGE population.
-
284. Name: JACK ROGGENBUCK on 2017-10-12 21:45:44
Comments:
-
285. Name: Debra REhn on 2017-10-12 23:06:04

Comments:

-
286. Name: Jody Gibson on 2017-10-12 23:07:24
Comments:
-
287. Name: Karl Aldinger on 2017-10-12 23:10:52
Comments:
-
288. Name: lisa weiss on 2017-10-12 23:14:38
Comments:
-
289. Name: Louisa Spinelli on 2017-10-12 23:18:04
Comments: NOT TEMPORARY STORAGE!...Please do the job right! Please keep us safe! Thank you very much!
-
290. Name: Lougene Anderson on 2017-10-12 23:19:03
Comments:
-
291. Name: Peter Butt on 2017-10-12 23:19:12
Comments:
-
292. Name: Hugh Moore on 2017-10-12 23:25:14
Comments:
-
293. Name: Judy Curry on 2017-10-12 23:28:36
Comments:
-
294. Name: James Odling on 2017-10-12 23:29:05
Comments:
-
295. Name: Richard Northrop on 2017-10-12 23:29:27
Comments:
-
296. Name: John W Dewey on 2017-10-12 23:31:08
Comments:
-
297. Name: Genevieve Riber on 2017-10-12 23:32:52
Comments:
-
298. Name: WILLIAM W BALLINGER on 2017-10-12 23:34:31
Comments:
-

299. Name: Amy Steinberg on 2017-10-12 23:37:14
Comments:
-
300. Name: Marilyn Ledoux on 2017-10-12 23:42:59
Comments: Please educate yourselves about the dangers posed by these temporary canisters and revoke the permit for Edison to use them indefinitely.
-
301. Name: Damon Wyler on 2017-10-12 23:47:44
Comments: Thank you for helping to increase safety at one of California's most valuable stretches of coastline!
-
302. Name: James Stone on 2017-10-13 00:01:13
Comments:
-
303. Name: Brian Siebert on 2017-10-13 00:07:37
Comments:
-
304. Name: Anne Dugaw on 2017-10-13 00:11:09
Comments:
-
305. Name: Peter Lee on 2017-10-13 00:16:15
Comments: The thin temporary storage canisters being used at San Onofre can not be inspected, repaired, maintained, monitored and transported without cracks. This is Unacceptable!
-
306. Name: Mr Evans on 2017-10-13 00:17:42
Comments:
-
307. Name: Joe Glaston on 2017-10-13 00:21:32
Comments:
-
308. Name: Alan Korsen on 2017-10-13 00:23:39
Comments: Hopefully the additional information will bring the light of day to a serious condition.
-
309. Name: Dorelle Rawlings on 2017-10-13 00:30:40
Comments: The safety of many people in southern California depend upon revoking Edison's Nuclear Waste Storage Permit at San Onofre. The company has made no attempt to assure the safe storage of nuclear waste, and it is important that San Onofre not become just another superfund site awaiting taxpayer funding for cleanup, because there is no good way to clean up buried and leaking nuclear waste canisters. Don't allow them to be buried in the first place!
-
310. Name: henry moser on 2017-10-13 00:31:16

Comments:

-
311. Name: Georgette Kersen on 2017-10-13 00:32:53
Comments: The best option is to remove that nuclear waste as soon as possible. The next best option is to be absolutely sure that the storage canisters are safe over the long term, i.e. repairable, maintainable, monitored and able to be transported without the scary possibility of forming cracks. In other words, REASONABLE requests for such a serious & potentially devastating issue.
-
312. Name: Cheryl Harding on 2017-10-13 00:33:13
Comments:
-
313. Name: David Eidsvold on 2017-10-13 00:36:33
Comments: Sano is not a nuke dump
-
314. Name: Kelley Scanlon on 2017-10-13 00:59:54
Comments:
-
315. Name: Shahrokh Mirjahangir on 2017-10-13 01:08:59
Comments: This is the only option for the Residence of Southern California to prevent a major Nuclear Catastrophe in our beloved Gold Coast. Thank you for your understanding
-
316. Name: Lucila Geva on 2017-10-13 01:59:18
Comments:
-
317. Name: Patrick Bosold on 2017-10-13 02:23:34
Comments: Revoke the current permit and issue one that makes the operators do it right, and do it right starting now.
-
318. Name: Todd Snyder on 2017-10-13 02:33:26
Comments:
-
319. Name: Meryle A Korn on 2017-10-13 02:34:21
Comments: There is NO safe place to store nuclear waste, and among the most unsafe is at a beach-side site in an earthquake zone. Does the name "Fukushima" mean anything to you?
-
320. Name: Marian Cruz on 2017-10-13 02:34:22
Comments: marian.cruz2903@gmail.com
-
321. Name: Susan Belson on 2017-10-13 02:46:22
Comments:
-

322. Name: Sharon Torrisi on 2017-10-13 03:06:41
Comments:
-
323. Name: Don McKelvey on 2017-10-13 03:14:42
Comments: This is a no-brainer !
-
324. Name: Paula Taylor on 2017-10-13 03:31:50
Comments:
-
325. Name: kim stanick on 2017-10-13 03:39:27
Comments:
-
326. Name: Pierre Kent Minault on 2017-10-13 04:06:51
Comments:
-
327. Name: Cheryl King on 2017-10-13 04:14:57
Comments: Keep up the good work. Fight for our planet!
-
328. Name: Rachael ashley on 2017-10-13 04:22:44
Comments:
-
329. Name: Kathleen Lavin on 2017-10-13 04:24:47
Comments: Can we RELOCATE/MOVE the waste out of the area???? It will be too close to the water line, and is on an earthquake fault line!
-
330. Name: Morris Sandel on 2017-10-13 04:26:30
Comments: STOP PRODUCING nuclear waste!
-
331. Name: gene burke on 2017-10-13 04:31:44
Comments: Clean up the CCC's approval of the Edison permit...please! Higher quality of nuclear waste storage security needed.
-
332. Name: Terri hunting on 2017-10-13 04:59:03
Comments:
-
333. Name: Michael Tomczyszyn on 2017-10-13 05:58:00
Comments:
-
334. Name: Kimberly Wiley on 2017-10-13 06:05:16
Comments:
-
335. Name: Preston Wilson on 2017-10-13 06:07:24

Comments: All the Nuclear waste need to be put in the Clintons garage

336. Name: Lisa Goldie on 2017-10-13 06:10:26
Comments:

337. Name: Beverly Findlay-Kaneko on 2017-10-13 06:15:43
Comments:

338. Name: Mary Eberle on 2017-10-13 07:19:48
Comments:

339. Name: Alex Bay on 2017-10-13 13:45:07
Comments:

340. Name: Lee Taft on 2017-10-13 14:11:44
Comments: San Clemente deserves better!

341. Name: Kathy Epeneter on 2017-10-13 14:31:39
Comments: Revoke the Nuclear Waste Storage Permit at SanO

342. Name: Sue Hubbard on 2017-10-13 14:42:58
Comments:

343. Name: turquoise cornwall on 2017-10-13 14:52:44
Comments:

344. Name: Selene Lawrence on 2017-10-13 15:21:38
Comments: Thanks for the good work

345. Name: James Mulcare on 2017-10-13 15:29:22
Comments:

346. Name: Joseph Cope on 2017-10-13 15:40:10
Comments:

347. Name: Tyler Kubota on 2017-10-13 15:43:59
Comments:

348. Name: Mary Bennett on 2017-10-13 15:48:35
Comments:

349. Name: Steve Hathaway on 2017-10-13 16:08:00

Comments:

-
350. Name: Cyndy Pietronico on 2017-10-13 17:42:25
Comments:
-
351. Name: Mark Reback on 2017-10-13 18:36:42
Comments:
-
352. Name: Robert Cosgrove on 2017-10-13 18:40:56
Comments: We are only a few miles from this site so we are concerned for our safety and those in and around us. And what do we suggest to the nation and world when we don't remedy issues we would be critical of with others?
-
353. Name: Patricia Martz on 2017-10-13 18:49:42
Comments: Burying the nuclear waste at San Onofre is unsafe, please reconsider the permit.
-
354. Name: James Sato on 2017-10-13 18:50:35
Comments:
-
355. Name: erin yarrobino on 2017-10-13 18:53:59
Comments:
-
356. Name: Wayne Eggleston on 2017-10-13 18:59:08
Comments: Nuclear waste does not belong on the coast
-
357. Name: Lori Mulvey on 2017-10-13 19:01:05
Comments:
-
358. Name: Luis G Alvarez on 2017-10-13 19:23:03
Comments: Makes no sense for a temporary storage of waste that threatens our lives and livelihood!! Please find permanent safe solution!!
-
359. Name: Sandra Nickols Schwartz on 2017-10-13 19:34:39
Comments: Put it in the Nevada mountain we all paid for and ready to use.
-
360. Name: James Donahue on 2017-10-13 19:43:09
Comments: Get it out of here
-
361. Name: erin yarrobino on 2017-10-13 20:37:28
Comments:
-

| | | | |
|------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| 362. | Name: Mónica Álvarez Zyrkowski | on 2017-10-13 21:38:12 | Comments: |
| 363. | Name: Nancy hayes | on 2017-10-13 21:57:59 | Comments: please care about people not profit |
| 364. | Name: Grant Beresford | on 2017-10-13 22:18:26 | Comments: |
| 365. | Name: Keith Piligian | on 2017-10-13 22:20:13 | Comments: |
| 366. | Name: Yvonne Alvarez | on 2017-10-13 22:21:47 | Comments: |
| 367. | Name: Mark Lyons | on 2017-10-13 22:32:43 | Comments: |
| 368. | Name: Debbie Rose | on 2017-10-13 22:33:54 | Comments: Yet another example of an irresponsible and uninformed organization putting the lives of residents in OC in great danger. Has nothing been learned from the Fukushima disaster?? |
| 369. | Name: Jill Mulato | on 2017-10-13 22:49:25 | Comments: |
| 370. | Name: Phil | on 2017-10-13 23:20:35 | Comments: |
| 371. | Name: Laura Muesse | on 2017-10-13 23:39:00 | Comments: |
| 372. | Name: Linda Rushing | on 2017-10-14 00:43:38 | Comments: We bought Laguna Canyon, could San Onofre be bought and handled properly? It is only a very small property on the oceanside. |
| 373. | Name: MICHAEL VIEW | on 2017-10-14 00:48:55 | Comments: |
| 374. | Name: Julie Mains | on 2017-10-14 00:51:04 | Comments: |

375. Name: Norman Mains on 2017-10-14 00:51:28
Comments:
-
376. Name: Pat Connolly on 2017-10-14 00:57:32
Comments:
-
377. Name: GREGORY YOUNG on 2017-10-14 02:27:47
Comments:
-
378. Name: Lisa Marks on 2017-10-14 02:33:31
Comments: We need observable, monitored, transportable containers. We need nothing but the best containers. Thank you.
-
379. Name: Carol nilsen on 2017-10-14 02:37:19
Comments:
-
380. Name: Vivian Levin on 2017-10-14 02:48:25
Comments:
-
381. Name: Lorene Laguna on 2017-10-14 02:57:38
Comments:
-
382. Name: Laurenn Barker on 2017-10-14 02:57:50
Comments: This issue is critical to all the people, wildlife and environment of southern California and beyond because of nuclear radiation drift. There is no possible justification for this spent nuclear waste to be left in its present location. Please revoke the permit to do so.
-
383. Name: Carol A Teague on 2017-10-14 03:02:44
Comments:
-
384. Name: Jerry spets on 2017-10-14 03:04:37
Comments:
-
385. Name: George Lefevre on 2017-10-14 03:11:50
Comments:
-
386. Name: Stacy gavin on 2017-10-14 03:31:43
Comments:
-
387. Name: Ann Rennacker on 2017-10-14 03:46:15
Comments: No leaky nukes!
-

388. Name: Dennis Trembly on 2017-10-14 03:55:09
Comments: It is past time for nuclear waste producers to be held accountable for their creation. Courses of action must be devised according to scientific fact, not corporate fantasy.
-
389. Name: Tom Painter on 2017-10-14 03:56:36
Comments: The storage of nuclear waste at San Clemente is unacceptable. The California Coastal Commission should do everything in its power to correct the situation.
-
390. Name: Roger Nilsen on 2017-10-14 04:05:13
Comments:
-
391. Name: johanna Felder on 2017-10-14 04:06:48
Comments: you must find a way to move the nuclear waste away from San Clemente.
-
392. Name: William Carrasco on 2017-10-14 04:21:42
Comments:
-
393. Name: James Cushing on 2017-10-14 06:10:27
Comments:
-
394. Name: Kate Clark on 2017-10-14 06:25:56
Comments:
-
395. Name: kay gallin on 2017-10-14 06:45:13
Comments:
-
396. Name: Sally Rosoff on 2017-10-14 08:42:30
Comments:
-
397. Name: barbara holty on 2017-10-14 13:45:44
Comments:
-
398. Name: Greg Wayer on 2017-10-14 13:57:46
Comments: Please store these out in the desert without a community close by for potential issues
-
399. Name: Ladan Masoudie on 2017-10-14 13:59:52
Comments:
-
400. Name: Sally Warrick on 2017-10-14 14:27:25
Comments:
-

401. Name: Cynthia Machuzick on 2017-10-14 14:32:53
Comments: Please get rid of these rods and keep us safe. Hold the government accountable to the contract when the sites were installed!!!
-
402. Name: Michelle Lincoln on 2017-10-14 14:32:56
Comments: The nuclear waste from San Onofre must not be stored at the current site which is an environmental hazard as well as a terrorist target!
-
403. Name: Christine Maclean on 2017-10-14 14:33:55
Comments:
-
404. Name: Philo Smith on 2017-10-14 14:34:03
Comments:
-
405. Name: Miki Bay on 2017-10-14 14:39:59
Comments: No more Fukushima here in California.
-
406. Name: Alex Bay on 2017-10-14 14:40:27
Comments:
-
407. Name: Carol on 2017-10-14 14:49:34
Comments:
-
408. Name: Mary Harley on 2017-10-14 14:50:25
Comments:
-
409. Name: Evelyn Bengston on 2017-10-14 14:54:37
Comments:
-
410. Name: Margaret Elliott on 2017-10-14 14:55:55
Comments:
-
411. Name: David Marks on 2017-10-14 14:57:38
Comments:
-
412. Name: Janice Burstin on 2017-10-14 14:59:16
Comments: UNACCEPTABLE & UNSAFE to bury radioactive waste in canisters that aren't thick enough to contain that waste!!!!
-
413. Name: Leah Vasquez on 2017-10-14 15:12:28
Comments: We are failing to protect life on this planet; moving casks to a permanent location is urgent but not at the expense of public safety, health and accountability.
-

414. Name: Melissa Brunicardi on 2017-10-14 15:16:31
Comments:
-
415. Name: R Vinci on 2017-10-14 15:20:53
Comments:
-
416. Name: Alan Korsen on 2017-10-14 15:37:23
Comments: Allowing nuclear waste to stay on our coast is not acceptable. To allow the waste to remain in casks subject to failure without inspection is irresponsible.
-
417. Name: Debbi Mellah on 2017-10-14 15:38:58
Comments:
-
418. Name: Gordon Orsborn on 2017-10-14 15:40:16
Comments:
-
419. Name: carmen hernandez on 2017-10-14 15:55:15
Comments: fearful of the unknown and what could happen in this area. Please do what is necessary to protect us all
-
420. Name: Patricia Holloway on 2017-10-14 16:00:07
Comments: REVOKE the permit before it's too late and waste is deposited on the beach near our homes and schools in these inadequate containers.
-
421. Name: sharla short on 2017-10-14 16:07:14
Comments:
-
422. Name: Keith Wood on 2017-10-14 16:11:54
Comments:
-
423. Name: DIANE JORDAN-SMITH on 2017-10-14 16:16:55
Comments:
-
424. Name: Kristin Birdsall on 2017-10-14 16:17:33
Comments:
-
425. Name: Victoria Yesenofski on 2017-10-14 16:22:49
Comments:
-
426. Name: Marillee Carroll on 2017-10-14 16:23:10
Comments:
-

427. Name: Mary Tilton on 2017-10-14 16:32:44
Comments: It is absurd to even fathom what is there now will protect the coast!!!!
Take a note from other countries' systems
-
428. Name: Rodger Elble on 2017-10-14 16:39:48
Comments:
-
429. Name: Lee Drucker on 2017-10-14 16:47:38
Comments:
-
430. Name: Victoria Bousman on 2017-10-14 17:03:28
Comments:
-
431. Name: Rhoberta Palasik on 2017-10-14 17:39:20
Comments:
-
432. Name: Christine Shields on 2017-10-14 17:39:36
Comments: Thank you for all you are doing to prevent this mass tragedy in So. Cal.
-
433. Name: Elliot Quint on 2017-10-14 18:07:06
Comments:
-
434. Name: Deborah Drucker on 2017-10-14 18:16:57
Comments:
-
435. Name: Charles Jepson on 2017-10-14 18:45:38
Comments: This is the greatest danger this region faces and should not even be considered in an earthquake (3 faults in area) zone and marine environment.
-
436. Name: Dolores Schultz on 2017-10-14 18:50:42
Comments: Without this, we will all soon glow in the dark.
-
437. Name: cameron cosgrove on 2017-10-14 19:01:26
Comments:
-
438. Name: Jolie Steers on 2017-10-14 19:14:07
Comments:
-
439. Name: Patricia Gracian on 2017-10-14 19:23:30
Comments: Inaction on this item is tantamount to dooming all Southern California communities to an eventual nuclear contamination event. I urge you to Revoke the nuclear waste storage permit for storage at or near San Onofre.
-

440. Name: Cathy Roby on 2017-10-14 19:44:42
Comments:
-
441. Name: Sandy Thurlow on 2017-10-14 20:06:04
Comments:
-
442. Name: Mary Ann Comes on 2017-10-14 20:58:32
Comments: We need a better way to store this stuff. This permit must be revoked.
-
443. Name: Lynda vogel on 2017-10-14 21:21:48
Comments: I live in SC and want to revoke nuclear waste storage permit at San Onofre!
-
444. Name: Dawne Price on 2017-10-14 22:51:44
Comments:
-
445. Name: Martha mericle on 2017-10-14 22:52:11
Comments:
-
446. Name: Larry Ulvestad on 2017-10-14 22:53:35
Comments:
-
447. Name: Charles E Hackwith Jr on 2017-10-14 23:10:49
Comments: So-called "temporary storage" for this nuclear waste without the capability of inspecting, monitoring or even repairing of these thinner storage casks for 20 years is based on too risky and unsubstantiated safety assurances. The Coastal Commission has to reconsider and demand stringent requirements now, not 20 years into an unpredictable future.
-
448. Name: Daniel Fynaardt on 2017-10-14 23:15:38
Comments:
-
449. Name: Marjorie B Sosa on 2017-10-14 23:21:47
Comments:
-
450. Name: Brad Warrick on 2017-10-15 00:03:06
Comments: Move the waste out to the middle of the Nevada desert, 100's of miles from civilization.
-
451. Name: Mantas Aukstuolis on 2017-10-15 00:32:32
Comments:
-
452. Name: Dave Patel on 2017-10-15 00:53:28
Comments:

-
453. Name: Mary Franta on 2017-10-15 01:04:15
Comments: Please help us dispose of these spent nuclear rods from our unstable beach front location in San Onofre. It needs to get moved and stored in a forever facility ASAP. Thank you
-
454. Name: Nikki Alexander on 2017-10-15 01:36:47
Comments: Let's not wait for a California Fukushima to act intelligently ~ PLEASE
-
455. Name: Ilene Blaisch on 2017-10-15 01:37:47
Comments: there is nothing so important as protecting these containers from leakage and bring them up to date - better yet remove them and the contents completely.
-
456. Name: J T Smith on 2017-10-15 01:53:06
Comments:
-
457. Name: Naomi Chianese on 2017-10-15 02:56:18
Comments:
-
458. Name: JOEL E OTTEN on 2017-10-15 03:10:04
Comments:
-
459. Name: Barbara Carr on 2017-10-15 03:24:19
Comments:
-
460. Name: Kristy Janczak on 2017-10-15 04:08:27
Comments:
-
461. Name: Edith Ogella on 2017-10-15 04:16:12
Comments:
-
462. Name: kerry dunbar on 2017-10-15 04:17:33
Comments:
-
463. Name: Janice Burstin on 2017-10-15 04:44:14
Comments:
-
464. Name: Roberta Bator on 2017-10-15 06:15:18
Comments:
-
465. Name: Anita Hammerschlag on 2017-10-15 06:58:13
Comments:
-

-
466. Name: Betty Lee on 2017-10-15 07:50:05
Comments:
-
467. Name: Jerome Kirsling on 2017-10-15 11:01:30
Comments: This is an issue of Homeland Security...protection of the citizens of this country from disaster!
-
468. Name: Dale Shawn on 2017-10-15 11:22:19
Comments:
-
469. Name: Len Willie on 2017-10-15 13:54:01
Comments:
-
470. Name: Jessica Cresseveur on 2017-10-15 13:55:50
Comments:
-
471. Name: Adam Schneider on 2017-10-15 13:58:49
Comments:
-
472. Name: Gail Camhi on 2017-10-15 14:00:35
Comments: Flawed equipment MUST be fixed -- NOW!
-
473. Name: James Padgett on 2017-10-15 14:02:56
Comments:
-
474. Name: Reed Johnson on 2017-10-15 14:04:15
Comments: The decision whether or not to store spent nuclear fuel at San Onofre, virtually on the beach, needs to be very carefully researched and evaluated as an incorrect decision will likely harm the environment and residents over a large area for a very long time.
-
475. Name: Jim Roby on 2017-10-15 14:07:31
Comments:
-
476. Name: Ann Rennacker on 2017-10-15 14:14:11
Comments: Keep nuclear waste safely contained, inspect canisters and store far from the Ocean and fault lines. One Fukushima disaster spilling radioactive waste into the Ocean is already affecting sea life, no more are wanted! There must be a safer plan.
-
477. Name: Jared Mabie on 2017-10-15 14:18:26
Comments:
-

478. Name: Adrienne Moumin on 2017-10-15 14:22:13
Comments:
-
479. Name: deedee almidia on 2017-10-15 14:41:28
Comments:
-
480. Name: Victoria MacBain on 2017-10-15 14:43:53
Comments:
-
481. Name: Ed Oberweiser on 2017-10-15 14:51:09
Comments: This decision was dead wrong. San Onofre's storage system is just as bad as the reactors themselves. were. They were shut down and so should the thin walled metal casks.
-
482. Name: Melissa Atkinson on 2017-10-15 14:51:42
Comments:
-
483. Name: David Haycraft on 2017-10-15 14:55:57
Comments:
-
484. Name: CAROL COLLINS on 2017-10-15 14:59:53
Comments:
-
485. Name: Harry Muesse on 2017-10-15 15:09:33
Comments:
-
486. Name: Miriam Landman on 2017-10-15 15:10:51
Comments: Protect public health. Acknowledge and prepare for the earthquake risks. Protect our common ocean. Don't just "hope for the best." Plan for the worst-case scenarios, which are entirely possible. Do the right thing.
-
487. Name: Deb Currie on 2017-10-15 15:19:06
Comments:
-
488. Name: Eric Jacobs on 2017-10-15 15:19:27
Comments: Using the cheapest storage method for nuclear waste is not just unsafe, it's STUPID!
-
489. Name: Alessandra Colfi on 2017-10-15 15:28:50
Comments: Radioactive nuclear waste in such a vulnerable site is criminal negligence and needs to be rectified immediately
-
490. Name: James Odling on 2017-10-15 15:30:21

Comments:

-
491. Name: Adriana Johnson on 2017-10-15 15:31:49
Comments:
-
492. Name: Nancy Pirozzi on 2017-10-15 15:35:29
Comments:
-
493. Name: Athena Murphy on 2017-10-15 15:40:02
Comments:
-
494. Name: Frances Howard on 2017-10-15 15:48:00
Comments:
-
495. Name: Jane Swanson on 2017-10-15 15:54:45
Comments: Given that high level radioactive wastes are lethal for hundreds of thousands of years, it is unpardonable to allow them to be stored in any but the most robust canisters and casks.
-
496. Name: Joseph Shulman on 2017-10-15 15:58:54
Comments:
-
497. Name: Badi Jeffers on 2017-10-15 16:01:09
Comments:
-
498. Name: Gerry Martocci on 2017-10-15 16:12:27
Comments:
-
499. Name: Rickey Westbrooks on 2017-10-15 16:14:13
Comments: Stop the MADNESS!!
-
500. Name: Karen Keller on 2017-10-15 16:14:48
Comments:
-
501. Name: Janice Burstin on 2017-10-15 16:16:06
Comments: It is UNSAFE to bury radioactive waste in UNACCEPTABLE canisters!!
-
502. Name: Sheila Parks on 2017-10-15 16:17:29
Comments: REVOKE the nuclear waste storage permit at San Onofre NOW. Do the right thing now. Thank you
-
503. Name: Leslie Aronson on 2017-10-15 16:18:00

Comments:

-
504. Name: Richard Dawson on 2017-10-15 16:21:22
Comments:
-
505. Name: Armand Ramirez on 2017-10-15 16:26:13
Comments:
-
506. Name: Simone Malboeuf on 2017-10-15 16:30:13
Comments: We need REAL protection for our environment and people. The CCC needs to do it's job - protecting the California Coastline environment, not just pretend to be doing it.
-
507. Name: nancymcdonell on 2017-10-15 16:32:44
Comments:
-
508. Name: Iris Edinger on 2017-10-15 16:33:17
Comments:
-
509. Name: Brenda Gaines on 2017-10-15 16:33:33
Comments:
-
510. Name: Joe and Dawn Fusco on 2017-10-15 16:34:07
Comments: Protect us and do the right thing!!
-
511. Name: Peter Butt on 2017-10-15 16:36:12
Comments: As a resident of Southern California I object to the myopic policy to store the SONGS waste on site in fragile containers. The release of the waste into the Pacific Ocean would be a global event, poisoning the entire ocean. We are all parties and victims of this policy.
-
512. Name: Kathleen vanHooser on 2017-10-15 16:37:13
Comments: This is unacceptable!
-
513. Name: Erin Vines on 2017-10-15 16:37:54
Comments:
-
514. Name: janet maker on 2017-10-15 16:40:23
Comments:
-
515. Name: helgaleena on 2017-10-15 16:43:10
Comments:
-

516. Name: Helen Hanna on 2017-10-15 16:48:42
Comments:
-
517. Name: Patrick Bosold on 2017-10-15 16:50:07
Comments: I helped establish the Coastal Commission in 1972. They need to do their job and end this menace, and make Edison go back and do it right.
-
518. Name: Caryn Graves on 2017-10-15 16:52:12
Comments:
-
519. Name: Jym Dyer on 2017-10-15 16:53:10
Comments:
-
520. Name: Anne Dugaw on 2017-10-15 16:59:18
Comments:
-
521. Name: Irene Brace on 2017-10-15 16:59:43
Comments: A planned disaster waiting to happen.
-
522. Name: anita simons on 2017-10-15 17:02:13
Comments:
-
523. Name: Erif Thunen on 2017-10-15 17:03:11
Comments:
-
524. Name: Brent Rocks on 2017-10-15 17:03:23
Comments:
-
525. Name: Roberta R Cordero on 2017-10-15 17:04:30
Comments:
-
526. Name: Sharon Barone on 2017-10-15 17:05:14
Comments:
-
527. Name: Maryellen Redish on 2017-10-15 17:06:46
Comments: This is too dangerous
-
528. Name: Aparna Bakhle on 2017-10-15 17:07:39
Comments:
-
529. Name: Sherry Cantu on 2017-10-15 17:10:32
Comments:

-
530. Name: Trevor Burkholder on 2017-10-15 17:15:30
Comments: Burying nuclear waste in the sand is like burying your head on the sand. The mess was made, now it needs to be cleaned up properly. This is not a project to take the cheap and easy way out!
-
531. Name: Cheriell Jensen on 2017-10-15 17:15:40
Comments: As the Coastal Commission you simply MUST protect the coast. REVOKE the Permit. Nuclear Storage does NOT belong on our precious coast. And certainly not in thin-walled canisters. Act now, BEFORE another nuclear disaster to our oceans.
-
532. Name: karen hafer on 2017-10-15 17:27:51
Comments:
-
533. Name: Jeri Buchanan on 2017-10-15 17:29:32
Comments:
-
534. Name: Alicia cali on 2017-10-15 17:31:16
Comments:
-
535. Name: Gail Camhi on 2017-10-15 17:31:32
Comments: Flawed permit, must REVOKE it NOW!
-
536. Name: ROxana finnell on 2017-10-15 17:31:34
Comments:
-
537. Name: evy justesen on 2017-10-15 17:31:36
Comments:
-
538. Name: Timothy LeBon on 2017-10-15 17:39:25
Comments: This is a very real risk to our local communities and an ongoing pollution risk to the whole world! We can't store waste for the long term on the beach in thin canisters. Protect our oceans!
-
539. Name: Judy Genandt on 2017-10-15 17:46:38
Comments:
-
540. Name: Bill Smirnow on 2017-10-15 17:57:09
Comments: Attempts to save \$\$ by using these extremely thin walled casks are completely irresponsible and criminal. They may result in catastrophic death, cancer, heart attacks, genetic, environmental and economic damage,
-
541. Name: Susan Faber on 2017-10-15 18:01:06

Comments:

-
542. Name: Susana Cohen-Cory on 2017-10-15 18:03:10
Comments:
-
543. Name: Robert McCormick on 2017-10-15 18:03:31
Comments:
-
544. Name: Marian Cruz on 2017-10-15 18:04:50
Comments: Revoke Nuclear Waste Storage at San Onofre!!!!
-
545. Name: James Padgett on 2017-10-15 18:15:55
Comments:
-
546. Name: Edith Ogella on 2017-10-15 18:17:33
Comments:
-
547. Name: Todd Snyder on 2017-10-15 18:21:29
Comments:
-
548. Name: Nancy Wallace Nelson on 2017-10-15 18:26:12
Comments: It is amnother disaster waiting to happen to have such ill-stored nuclear waste on an earthquake fault. Did we learn nothing from Japan's Fukushima?
-
549. Name: Sandy esque on 2017-10-15 18:28:49
Comments:
-
550. Name: Jason Bowman on 2017-10-15 18:33:26
Comments:
-
551. Name: David Reilly on 2017-10-15 18:41:00
Comments: No Nukes. Ever.
-
552. Name: Robert M Gisonno on 2017-10-15 18:43:57
Comments: Level San Onofre ship out the nuclear waste...and make the land into a park as it should be!
-
553. Name: Wendy Yoder on 2017-10-15 18:45:26
Comments: Please do not bury nuclear waste on our coastline.
-
554. Name: Randi Johnson on 2017-10-15 18:48:33
Comments:

-
555. Name: Mary Eberle on 2017-10-15 18:49:36
Comments:
-
556. Name: Corey E Olsen on 2017-10-15 19:00:46
Comments: No nuclear waste storage permit for San Onofre.
-
557. Name: S STEPHENS on 2017-10-15 19:01:52
Comments: Nuclear waste LASTS THOUSANDS OF YEARS - California is GROUND ZERO FOR QUAKES! What part of FUKASHIMA 2.0 does NOT compute WHEN THE "BIG ONE" HITS???
-
558. Name: Jon Sherman on 2017-10-15 19:07:25
Comments:
-
559. Name: T Bell on 2017-10-15 19:19:00
Comments: WILLFUL IGNORANCE AND NUKES DON'T MIX WELL
-
560. Name: Dr Mha Atma S Khalsa on 2017-10-15 19:21:47
Comments:
-
561. Name: Darlene St Martin on 2017-10-15 19:23:17
Comments:
-
562. Name: Diane Hutchison on 2017-10-15 19:26:16
Comments:
-
563. Name: Beth Angel on 2017-10-15 19:34:38
Comments:
-
564. Name: henry on 2017-10-15 19:39:46
Comments:
-
565. Name: JENIFER JOHN JUSTIN MASSEY on 2017-10-15 19:47:20
Comments: SET A GOOD EXAMPLE BY RESCINDING YOUR PERMIT NOW TO AVOID BEING SUED LATER
-
566. Name: pamela nelson on 2017-10-15 19:59:35
Comments: Please use up-graded storage containers---millions of people's lives depend on you.
-
567. Name: Karen Tanner on 2017-10-15 20:07:37

Comments: This waste is a ticking time bomb. I would question the sanity of anyone who would recommend leaving it sitting on the beach, surrounded by millions of homeowners on one side and the ocean on the other. Since this area is in a fault zone, this could easily be a repeat of Fukushima. That would be a disaster of gigantic magnitude. And...if you can't find a safe way to store nuclear waste, stop producing it. That's only common sense.

-
568. Name: Nonie Fickling on 2017-10-15 20:11:34
Comments: It is puzzling to me that the thin-wall canisters are even being considered to store San Onofre's nuclear waste when there are canisters available which would give far more protection from nuclear leaks. At one Community Engagement Panel meeting it was noted that the thin-walled canister "could" withstand a 7.0 magnitude earthquake. That leaves little margin for exceptions. This horrendous situation must be met with the highest standards available. The consequences are too great.
-
569. Name: George Stradtman on 2017-10-15 20:23:40
Comments: Radioactive poisons have already crossed the Pacific from Fukushima to the west coast of America. The last thing we need, is yet another nuclear disaster due to waste leakage that would very likely follow a major earthquake at San Onofre.
-
570. Name: mel freilicher on 2017-10-15 20:24:10
Comments:
-
571. Name: Todd Strohmeier on 2017-10-15 20:27:38
Comments: The permit that was approved for Edison is flawed and must be revoked.
-
572. Name: Myphon Hunt on 2017-10-15 20:30:55
Comments:
-
573. Name: Matthew Iskra on 2017-10-15 20:33:14
Comments:
-
574. Name: Barbara DuBois Hoag on 2017-10-15 20:39:06
Comments: Please listen to San Clemente Green and find a safe storage solution for San Onofre's nuclear waste. Thanks
-
575. Name: Gail Cohn on 2017-10-15 20:48:40
Comments:
-
576. Name: Ruth Strauss on 2017-10-15 20:48:58
Comments: This is a MUST--it would be unconscionable not to follow through on the recommendations and least that needs to be done to keep our oceans and water safe--the work has been done FOR YOU in terms of researching what NEEDS to be done--now ALL YOU HAVE TO DO IS IMPLEMENT IT.
-

-
577. Name: Jolana Vanek on 2017-10-15 21:02:14
Comments:
-
578. Name: S Stoneman on 2017-10-15 21:20:04
Comments:
-
579. Name: Frances O'Neill Zimmerman on 2017-10-15 21:21:37
Comments:
-
580. Name: Denise Liebmann on 2017-10-15 21:31:11
Comments: Please sign to keep nuclear waste from being buried on our oc coast.
-
581. Name: Keith R Morrison on 2017-10-15 21:32:32
Comments: Not There, Not ever
-
582. Name: James Murphy on 2017-10-15 21:34:29
Comments:
-
583. Name: Cheryl Harding on 2017-10-15 21:37:23
Comments:
-
584. Name: Ellen Rosser on 2017-10-15 21:49:43
Comments:
-
585. Name: Jody Gibson on 2017-10-15 21:50:03
Comments:
-
586. Name: Natalie Van Leekwijck on 2017-10-15 21:59:31
Comments:
-
587. Name: Michael Mallough on 2017-10-15 22:05:08
Comments:
-
588. Name: Linda Fashing on 2017-10-15 22:16:40
Comments:
-
589. Name: Marilyn Duba on 2017-10-15 22:18:31
Comments:
-
590. Name: Iolette pisoni on 2017-10-15 22:21:41
Comments:
-

591. Name: Stephen Brittle on 2017-10-15 22:33:23
Comments: Revoke this permit before there is a disaster!
-
592. Name: Susan Willhoit on 2017-10-15 22:50:12
Comments: Think beyond the cheaper cost....think of your children and grandchildren.
-
593. Name: Jim Wells on 2017-10-15 22:50:33
Comments:
-
594. Name: Barbara Fox on 2017-10-15 22:50:42
Comments:
-
595. Name: Amy Steinberg on 2017-10-15 23:03:18
Comments:
-
596. Name: Joe Feinstein on 2017-10-15 23:16:07
Comments:
-
597. Name: Patricia Baley on 2017-10-15 23:17:59
Comments:
-
598. Name: sandy mccanne on 2017-10-15 23:28:03
Comments:
-
599. Name: Bill Fickling on 2017-10-15 23:28:34
Comments:
-
600. Name: Paula Penn on 2017-10-15 23:49:06
Comments:
-
601. Name: David Hermanns on 2017-10-15 23:52:49
Comments:
-
602. Name: Kelley Scanlon on 2017-10-16 00:30:02
Comments:
-
603. Name: Cathy Deppe on 2017-10-16 00:47:27
Comments: Please support this call
-
604. Name: Evelyn Sato on 2017-10-16 00:48:29
Comments:
-

605. Name: Terry on 2017-10-16 00:50:15
Comments: Please don't bury it here, so close to the surface and so close to millions of people.
-
606. Name: Deb on 2017-10-16 00:52:01
Comments:
-
607. Name: James Mulcare on 2017-10-16 01:07:11
Comments:
-
608. Name: Lanier Hines on 2017-10-16 01:39:45
Comments:
-
609. Name: Joe Glaston on 2017-10-16 01:44:41
Comments:
-
610. Name: Vina Colley on 2017-10-16 02:03:49
Comments: I am a whistleblower from the Portsmouth/Piketon , Ohio Gaseous Diffusion plant. We have a very serious problem at many site with the waste. My co-workers our dying or like me fighting health issues. Nuclear waste is very serious hazardous waste and a environmental problem now facing us all. It's our responsibility to future generations to solve this problem in a safe place.
-
611. Name: Linda hogan-estrada on 2017-10-16 02:37:15
Comments: I vote not to silently kill good AMERICANS
-
612. Name: Dorelle Rawlings on 2017-10-16 02:37:56
Comments: Fix this problem. Allowing Edison to bury nuclear waste next to the ocean in thin-walled casks is just crazy!
-
613. Name: Hisako Oba on 2017-10-16 02:39:38
Comments:
-
614. Name: Joy Hoover on 2017-10-16 02:51:59
Comments:
-
615. Name: John Krauss on 2017-10-16 02:59:52
Comments: stop this madness. clean the area & leave no trace
-
616. Name: Don McKelvey on 2017-10-16 03:05:21
Comments: This is a no-brainer !
-
617. Name: karen L black on 2017-10-16 03:12:39

Comments: Let common sense and not greed be your guide.

618. Name: Don McKelvey on 2017-10-16 03:39:35
Comments: This is a no-brainer !

619. Name: Nina Babiarz on 2017-10-16 03:40:45
Comments:

620. Name: Brandon Hill on 2017-10-16 04:09:05
Comments:

621. Name: Joe Salazar on 2017-10-16 04:17:32
Comments:

622. Name: Michelle Gordon on 2017-10-16 04:19:23
Comments:

623. Name: Michael Tomczyszyn on 2017-10-16 04:56:57
Comments:

624. Name: Jim Waide on 2017-10-16 05:09:48
Comments:

625. Name: Linda C Jones on 2017-10-16 05:13:23
Comments: The permit you approved for Edison was flawed and must be revoked. The Special Conditions in the Coastal Permit that are twenty years out are well intended, but should have been required from the start. Other countries currently use nuclear waste storage systems that could meet those reasonable requirements today. Their containers can be inspected, repaired, maintained, monitored and transported without cracks. The thin canisters being used at San Onofre have none of these attributes because they were only intended for temporary storage.

626. Name: Mona Ferner on 2017-10-16 05:39:25
Comments:

627. Name: marie inserra on 2017-10-16 05:44:13
Comments:

628. Name: Carol Huntsman on 2017-10-16 05:46:58
Comments:

629. Name: Sherry Pollack on 2017-10-16 05:56:05
Comments:

-
630. Name: Scott Atkinson on 2017-10-16 06:29:28
Comments:
-
631. Name: Roger Rudholm on 2017-10-16 08:03:42
Comments:
-
632. Name: Marleen Gillespie on 2017-10-16 08:24:02
Comments:
-
633. Name: Peter Lee on 2017-10-16 09:18:00
Comments: Too Dangerous!
-
634. Name: Fred Jakobcic on 2017-10-16 11:22:27
Comments: Waste is radioactive, waste water, dangerous and inefficient and expensive and dirty-read NUCLEAR ROULETTE
-
635. Name: Dennis Ledden on 2017-10-16 11:44:20
Comments:
-
636. Name: Eli Suissa on 2017-10-16 11:48:34
Comments:
-
637. Name: Jana Murphy on 2017-10-16 12:44:27
Comments:
-
638. Name: Lisa Tart on 2017-10-16 13:20:01
Comments:
-
639. Name: cindy stucker on 2017-10-16 13:33:12
Comments:
-
640. Name: Patricia Brumfield on 2017-10-16 13:38:17
Comments: The citizens of Southern CA are outraged and terrified at what So Ca Edison is trying to do! This permit must be stopped until an independent study is done.
-
641. Name: Patricia Mehlberg on 2017-10-16 13:54:31
Comments:
-
642. Name: Ed Oberweiser on 2017-10-16 13:56:01
Comments: PG&E has a very bad record as regards nuclear safety. They should never have built San Onofre in the first place. It sits over a right face vertical fault and it failed.

That's why it has been shut downl.

643. Name: D on 2017-10-16 14:01:40
Comments:

644. Name: James Stone on 2017-10-16 14:46:44
Comments:

645. Name: Stephanie Richards on 2017-10-16 14:54:49
Comments:

646. Name: Kay Ospital on 2017-10-16 15:08:59
Comments:

647. Name: Ronald Warren on 2017-10-16 15:25:24
Comments:

648. Name: Luanne biggs on 2017-10-16 15:58:36
Comments:

649. Name: Stephen Joseph Libert on 2017-10-16 16:19:01
Comments:

650. Name: Nancy Staek on 2017-10-16 16:25:35
Comments: permit they approved for Edison was flawed and must be revoked. The Special Conditions in the Coastal Permit that are twenty years out are well intended, but should have been required from the start. Other countries currently use nuclear waste storage systems that could meet those reasonable requirements today. Their containers can be inspected, repaired, maintained, monitored and transported without cracks. The thin canisters being used at San Onofre have none of these attributes because they were only intended for temporary storage.!!

651. Name: Linda Seeley on 2017-10-16 16:28:01
Comments:

652. Name: Ruth Cohen on 2017-10-16 16:33:27
Comments:

653. Name: Omid Kanani on 2017-10-16 16:40:26
Comments: I moved from KY to beautiful San Clemente and the last thing I ever imagined is that I will be living around 10 miles from Nuclear waste stored on my beach. Shame, Shame, Shame....

654. Name: Lisa Spinelli on 2017-10-16 16:42:23
Comments: Please rewrite your permit to have a more viable solution to removing the the dangerous and poorly constructed nuclear waste canisters at San Onofre. Our community is at risk!
-
655. Name: Gerry Martocci on 2017-10-16 17:15:07
Comments:
-
656. Name: Michael Gomel on 2017-10-16 17:30:11
Comments:
-
657. Name: Nicholas Hernandez on 2017-10-16 17:48:03
Comments:
-
658. Name: Rosemarie Marousek on 2017-10-16 17:49:45
Comments:
-
659. Name: Mark Reback on 2017-10-16 17:50:18
Comments:
-
660. Name: Judith Lang on 2017-10-16 17:59:24
Comments: Find another place for storage. You've had many years to do so. I knew the original plan probably did not provide for safe disposal elsewhere. Shame on you
-
661. Name: susan nutter on 2017-10-16 18:10:20
Comments:
-
662. Name: Joel Jatón on 2017-10-16 18:39:44
Comments: Please make restitution for the prior mistake made by approving a hazardous energy plant right next to one of our State's most crucial rail and road transportation corridors by revoking the permit to permanently store 1800 tons of high level radioactive waste generated over the history of this plant.
-
663. Name: JoAn Saltzen on 2017-10-16 18:58:11
Comments:
-
664. Name: Michael Steinberg on 2017-10-16 19:15:05
Comments:
-
665. Name: Citizen Voter on 2017-10-16 19:33:50
Comments: when will 'we' learn???
-
666. Name: Patricia Janssen on 2017-10-16 19:39:11

Comments: Yes make Edison accountable for this. Their actions are unconscionable and hurting our health and environment

667. Name: Skip Shaputnic on 2017-10-16 21:33:29
Comments:

668. Name: alan papsun on 2017-10-16 21:35:37
Comments:

669. Name: Carey Strombotne on 2017-10-16 22:15:17
Comments:

670. Name: Pegi cheatum on 2017-10-16 22:28:13
Comments:

671. Name: Ran Zirasri on 2017-10-16 23:16:09
Comments:

672. Name: Donna Walling on 2017-10-16 23:52:12
Comments:

673. Name: Rose Marie Leather on 2017-10-17 00:23:22
Comments:

674. Name: Barbara Mollure on 2017-10-17 00:59:35
Comments: It is important to our residents that this waste material is moved to a safe location somewhere else.

675. Name: Iris Edinger on 2017-10-17 01:58:03
Comments:

676. Name: Rose Marie Leather on 2017-10-17 02:27:49
Comments:

677. Name: Leslie on 2017-10-17 02:35:54
Comments:

678. Name: Linda Berry on 2017-10-17 03:48:55
Comments:

679. Name: Judy Alter on 2017-10-17 03:53:19
Comments:

-
680. Name: Carroll Arkema on 2017-10-17 03:56:10
Comments:
-
681. Name: Kumi Abe on 2017-10-17 04:23:55
Comments:
-
682. Name: Jennifer Collins on 2017-10-17 04:52:25
Comments: A nuclear waste dump storage does not belong in a highly populated area already situated on a major earthquake fault line. Period!
-
683. Name: Justin Clancy on 2017-10-17 05:09:45
Comments:
-
684. Name: Akiyo Kawabata on 2017-10-17 05:24:21
Comments:
-
685. Name: Akiyo Kawabata on 2017-10-17 05:24:21
Comments:
-
686. Name: Pamela horowitz on 2017-10-17 06:31:01
Comments:
-
687. Name: Judy Northrop on 2017-10-17 14:47:38
Comments:
-
688. Name: andy toepel on 2017-10-17 15:45:30
Comments:
-
689. Name: Bruce White on 2017-10-17 16:14:37
Comments: Perfect example of why nuclear is Bad. Who wants the hazardous waste. No One!! Especially not along our coast line. Earth quakes , etc.
-
690. Name: Margaret Elliott on 2017-10-17 16:18:22
Comments:
-
691. Name: Margaret Elliott on 2017-10-17 16:33:08
Comments:
-
692. Name: Laura Lynch on 2017-10-17 16:39:37
Comments:
-

693. Name: Margaret Elliott on 2017-10-17 16:44:48
Comments:
-
694. Name: Paula D Penn on 2017-10-17 17:42:28
Comments:
-
695. Name: Bret Burgess on 2017-10-17 18:10:30
Comments: Please, for the sake of everyone, not just San Clemente residents, let's find a better place to store nuclear waste than San Onofre State Beach!
-
696. Name: Janet Leger on 2017-10-17 18:41:00
Comments:
-
697. Name: Laura Gallagher on 2017-10-17 19:44:42
Comments: Closing down San Onofre was a great step toward protecting such a populous area located in an active seismic zone from a nuclear disaster. But it will all be for naught if the spent fuel rods are stored there. We are still in danger. Thank you, Gary and all, for your hard work and dedication to get this critical step accomplished.
-
698. Name: Bethann Chambers on 2017-10-17 23:15:48
Comments:
-
699. Name: Mary Franz on 2017-10-17 23:42:57
Comments: It seems so obvious, San Onofre is NOT a safe place to store nuclear waste.
-
700. Name: Harriette Mayo on 2017-10-18 00:06:02
Comments:
-
701. Name: Loretta Busam on 2017-10-18 00:22:09
Comments:
-
702. Name: Kelly Wilson on 2017-10-18 02:44:47
Comments:
-
703. Name: Kelly Gaughan on 2017-10-18 02:46:05
Comments:
-
704. Name: Judy Teverbaugh on 2017-10-18 03:56:42
Comments:
-
705. Name: Michelle Schumacher on 2017-10-18 04:24:59
Comments: Have the federal government use the process available to turn the waste into inert glass chips - do not bury this in the ocean ever

-
706. Name: Julie Ostoich on 2017-10-18 04:33:02
Comments:
-
707. Name: Marianne Seldman on 2017-10-18 05:05:59
Comments: Must be moved
-
708. Name: Linda Rosoff on 2017-10-18 11:13:02
Comments:
-
709. Name: Veronica on 2017-10-18 13:40:27
Comments: For obvious reasons - dangerous to human bodies.
-
710. Name: Loretta L Zupancic on 2017-10-18 15:47:23
Comments:
-
711. Name: Iris Bourne on 2017-10-18 18:03:14
Comments: revoke nuclear waste storage permit at san onofre
-
712. Name: DAVID BROKAW on 2017-10-18 18:54:20
Comments:
-
713. Name: Jeanette Morck on 2017-10-18 19:19:28
Comments:
-
714. Name: Talia on 2017-10-18 20:11:34
Comments:
-
715. Name: Carey Strombotne on 2017-10-18 20:46:19
Comments: This is more than a dangerous situation. Keeping the toxic waste so close to neighborhoods, traffic corridors and the ocean is a disaster in the making.
-
716. Name: Joan Whitley on 2017-10-18 22:34:13
Comments:
-
717. Name: Norman Seldman on 2017-10-18 23:29:00
Comments:
-
718. Name: John J Gavin on 2017-10-18 23:53:06
Comments:
-
719. Name: Steve Netherby on 2017-10-19 00:04:15

Comments: This is the existential threat about which all we San Clementeans live in denial. And the potential disasters inherent in doing this poorly involve all of Southern California—in fact our whole country. Let's do it right—for ourselves and, especially, for our kids and grandkids.

720. Name: Lawrence Barber on 2017-10-19 00:07:51
Comments:

721. Name: Conor Hughes on 2017-10-19 00:30:25
Comments:

722. Name: Art Hanson on 2017-10-19 04:29:21
Comments: The short-term and the long-term dangers are far too great.

723. Name: Nick Alvaro on 2017-10-19 18:02:34
Comments:

724. Name: Jonathan Schara on 2017-10-19 18:21:30
Comments:

725. Name: Marian Cruz on 2017-10-20 15:41:40
Comments:

726. Name: Debra Rehn on 2017-10-20 15:42:48
Comments:

727. Name: Kevin Branstetter on 2017-10-20 15:49:29
Comments:

728. Name: Edward Maher on 2017-10-20 15:50:34
Comments: We can't afford to do anything but the safest approach. In retrospect, the cost would seem a petty obstacle if an accident happened. I would also join the fight to hold those responsible accountable.

729. Name: janet maker on 2017-10-20 15:50:45
Comments:

730. Name: Amy Steinberg on 2017-10-20 16:03:31
Comments:

731. Name: susan peirce on 2017-10-20 16:05:55
Comments:

732. Name: Corey E Olsen on 2017-10-20 16:07:38
Comments:
-
733. Name: alan pascun on 2017-10-20 16:12:21
Comments:
-
734. Name: Miki Bay on 2017-10-20 16:18:38
Comments:
-
735. Name: Lorenz Steininger on 2017-10-20 16:20:30
Comments:
-
736. Name: richard sauerheber on 2017-10-20 16:28:01
Comments: Plutonium and related hot waste created from fission reactions have half lives so great that no storage system is sufficient to protect from human inhalation of matter that can irradiate tissue for lifetimes. The best system available must be used to kick the can down the road as far as possible; otherwise one is simply prodding the can with a stick. .
-
737. Name: Laura Roberts on 2017-10-20 16:30:17
Comments:
-
738. Name: Christine Bucklin on 2017-10-20 16:31:53
Comments:
-
739. Name: Edith Ogella on 2017-10-20 16:32:11
Comments:
-
740. Name: Leslie Cassidy on 2017-10-20 16:37:17
Comments:
-
741. Name: Erif Thunen on 2017-10-20 16:52:13
Comments:
-
742. Name: Judy Malouf on 2017-10-20 17:17:49
Comments:
-
743. Name: Margaret Mapes on 2017-10-20 17:24:37
Comments:
-
744. Name: Karen Keller on 2017-10-20 17:26:05
Comments:
-

745. Name: Mark Reback on 2017-10-20 17:33:05
Comments:
-
746. Name: Marillee Carroll on 2017-10-20 17:50:57
Comments:
-
747. Name: Shahrokh Mirjahangir on 2017-10-20 17:57:10
Comments: Do Not Risk Future of Southern California' Gold Coast.
"SCE" Executive Board: Don't be Penny wise and Pound Foolish
-
748. Name: Charis Williams on 2017-10-20 17:58:07
Comments:
-
749. Name: jerry collamer on 2017-10-20 18:11:39
Comments: Revoke the permit before it's too late
-
750. Name: Ulla Barr on 2017-10-20 19:03:12
Comments:
-
751. Name: Arlene Johnson on 2017-10-20 20:23:52
Comments: A very concerned San Clemente homeowner
-
752. Name: Ann Isolde on 2017-10-20 20:41:47
Comments:
-
753. Name: Anna Barr on 2017-10-20 21:13:10
Comments: Revoke and replace! Lives are at stake.
-
754. Name: Don McKelvey on 2017-10-20 21:43:32
Comments:
-
755. Name: karen hafer on 2017-10-20 23:55:35
Comments:
-
756. Name: Linda Pierce on 2017-10-20 23:58:11
Comments:
-
757. Name: helgaleena on 2017-10-21 01:15:15
Comments:
-
758. Name: Tim Carras on 2017-10-21 01:18:17
Comments:

-
759. Name: Kelley Scanlon on 2017-10-21 01:56:45
Comments:
-
760. Name: John Zimmermann on 2017-10-21 02:03:29
Comments:
-
761. Name: Dr Mha Atma S Khalsa on 2017-10-21 02:48:39
Comments:
-
762. Name: Dennis Ledden on 2017-10-21 11:40:09
Comments:
-
763. Name: John Leonetti on 2017-10-21 13:01:08
Comments: There should be no question about making the canisters as thick and safe as possible, like other countries, NO QUESTION!!
-
764. Name: Judy Attanasio on 2017-10-21 15:56:37
Comments:
-
765. Name: SCho on 2017-10-21 16:18:34
Comments: If it is dangerous you have to store it safe.
-
766. Name: Natalie Van Leekwijck on 2017-10-21 18:21:50
Comments:
-
767. Name: Laurel Facey on 2017-10-21 20:39:03
Comments: Do we need to wait and worry about the fault lines and the next big earthquake?
-
768. Name: Jeff Taylor on 2017-10-21 23:20:09
Comments: Hey Edison! I'm sick and tired of your penny pinching pound foolish ways. Playing God with MY future. S##T or get of the toilet and let someone with intelligence and concern finish the job you so miserably F##KED up! Do it, and do it NOW! Remember, karma has no expiration date!
-
769. Name: Pamela Nelson on 2017-10-22 02:25:55
Comments: remove from the coast---inland a bit?
-
770. Name: roger johnson on 2017-10-22 06:05:36
Comments:
-

771. Name: J Spangler on 2017-10-22 14:18:02
Comments: Nuclear power and waste pose a dire threat for generations to come. Please look to truly clean, renewable alternatives.
-
772. Name: Susan Sall on 2017-10-22 15:46:42
Comments:
-
773. Name: Gail Collins on 2017-10-22 17:11:47
Comments:
-
774. Name: Denise Schnarr on 2017-10-22 18:30:22
Comments:
-
775. Name: Emily Corbitt on 2017-10-22 19:10:46
Comments: P
-
776. Name: Craig on 2017-10-22 19:44:15
Comments: Keep San Onofre as the beacon of the local surfing community
-
777. Name: karin michielsen on 2017-10-22 19:51:11
Comments:
-
778. Name: Erin alder on 2017-10-22 19:53:18
Comments:
-
779. Name: Kathleen Kaiser on 2017-10-22 19:53:24
Comments: I can't believe that our wonderful town is facing nuclear storage at the south and a toll road at the north.
-
780. Name: Teri on 2017-10-22 19:56:34
Comments: Not at the beach!!!
-
781. Name: ronnie theroux on 2017-10-22 20:35:09
Comments: Don't bury nuclear waste and try to fix the problem when we have a leak. There is no fix, you just want us to forget about it
-
782. Name: Joseph lopez on 2017-10-22 20:53:30
Comments:
-
783. Name: Jean Auris on 2017-10-22 20:57:50
Comments: Get serious for your safety sake.
-

784. Name: Deanna Polk on 2017-10-22 20:57:54
Comments:
-
785. Name: William Netherby on 2017-10-22 21:24:56
Comments: We don't need nuclear storage on such a beautiful stretch of coastline.
-
786. Name: Leeleenaka on 2017-10-22 21:30:14
Comments:
-
787. Name: Aimee Berberet on 2017-10-22 22:17:25
Comments: The original plan, when you got your permit for the Nuc Power Plant, was to store the waste elsewhere. You need to honor that!
-
788. Name: Alexander Wooton on 2017-10-22 22:21:40
Comments:
-
789. Name: Kim larson on 2017-10-22 22:46:11
Comments:
-
790. Name: Jennifer Johnson on 2017-10-22 23:35:04
Comments:
-
791. Name: Theo Bloxk on 2017-10-23 00:03:41
Comments:
-
792. Name: Sandy Highberg on 2017-10-23 00:35:15
Comments: Nuclear waste should NEVER be stored this close to the ocean on an earthquake fault!
-
793. Name: Kristen Racine on 2017-10-23 00:55:32
Comments: For the love of God, do not bury nuclear waste at San Onofre! It's a recipe for disaster.
-
794. Name: Carleen Chandler on 2017-10-23 01:08:36
Comments:
-
795. Name: Carol Keene on 2017-10-23 01:24:39
Comments:
-
796. Name: Doris Schiller on 2017-10-23 01:32:05
Comments:
-

797. Name: Maggie O'Grady on 2017-10-23 02:55:49
Comments:
-
798. Name: James McDaniel on 2017-10-23 02:56:31
Comments:
-
799. Name: Megan McDaniel on 2017-10-23 02:59:18
Comments:
-
800. Name: Laura Smith on 2017-10-23 03:00:12
Comments: The nuclear waste must Not be stored at or anywhere near San Onofre! That is Way to Dangerous! Move it out of here NOW!
-
801. Name: Lana Poppen on 2017-10-23 03:15:55
Comments:
-
802. Name: Bill Smirnow on 2017-10-23 04:16:48
Comments: The permit issued to S Cal Edison needs to be revoked. Storing nuclear waste with over 75 times the amount of radiation that Chernobyl released in extremely thin walled cannisters 108 feet from the ocean and inches from high tides that can't be monitored or corrected is astonishingly dangerous. It threatens the Pacific Ocean, and depending on the direction of the winds massive parts of southern California, all of California, part or all of Mexico and much of the northern hemisphere with a subsequent global environmental and economic meltdown.
-
803. Name: alexander lane on 2017-10-23 06:07:47
Comments: ...been loving the coast around san onofre for the last 35 years...would like to believe it will last AT LEAST another 35 without succumbing to nuclear waste. Please use the thicker canisters!
-
804. Name: Diane L on 2017-10-23 06:15:36
Comments:
-
805. Name: Sheila Parks on 2017-10-23 07:25:38
Comments: Revoke flawed permit for Edison. What could you be thinking of?
-
806. Name: Devra Rossi on 2017-10-23 07:38:16
Comments:
-
807. Name: theresa van etten on 2017-10-23 08:41:30
Comments:
-
808. Name: Jacquelyn Drechsler on 2017-10-23 12:35:03
Comments:

-
809. Name: Jean Fallon on 2017-10-23 12:38:11
Comments: Those who make decisions like this should be required to live next to the disposal area!
-
810. Name: Sally Jane eEllert on 2017-10-23 13:04:10
Comments: Please note that I am NOT suggesting that the waste should be removed; rather, that the ON-site storage be in thick-wall canisters designed for longer, safer storage. Whether permit revocation is appropriate, or whether there are other means of achieving this, I don't know—but I do know that the current situation is not safe.
-
811. Name: Matthew Iskra on 2017-10-23 13:28:42
Comments:
-
812. Name: Daneen Lindner on 2017-10-23 14:05:53
Comments:
-
813. Name: Harvey Schaktman on 2017-10-23 14:15:31
Comments:
-
814. Name: Amy on 2017-10-23 14:48:59
Comments: No Nukes
-
815. Name: Bruce White on 2017-10-23 15:45:39
Comments:
-
816. Name: Gary Shaw on 2017-10-23 15:47:20
Comments: Just as Sally Jane Ellert wrote, I do not approve of moving high level radioactive waste off-site, but the canisters must be robust and inspect-able.
-
817. Name: Sarah Fields on 2017-10-23 16:41:29
Comments: The decisions made regarding the need for thick-walled canisters that can be inspected, repaired, monitored, and transported safely will affect not only San Onofre, but the communities near all reactor sites and the numerous communities on the transport routes. The safety of nuclear waste storage and transport systems is a matter of national importance. My county in Utah is on a major proposed route, as are many communities that may be unaware of the hazards at this time of possible transport in unsafe containers.
-
818. Name: Nancy Rohr on 2017-10-23 16:47:02
Comments:
-
819. Name: David A Kraft on 2017-10-23 16:57:58
Comments: Utilize "hardened on-site storage" (HOSS), too
-

-
820. Name: lynda on 2017-10-23 17:39:49
Comments:
-
821. Name: Christy Armstrong on 2017-10-23 18:54:07
Comments: Until this material is in thicker casks you cannot in good conscience allow this permit to go forward!!
-
822. Name: Erif Thunen on 2017-10-23 19:48:12
Comments:
-
823. Name: Bill Smirnow on 2017-10-23 21:16:33
Comments: Planning to bury more than 75 Chernobyls worth of nuclear waste in extremely thin walled cannisters [mostly one half inch to five eighths of an inch thick] while the rest of the world uses cannisters that are 10 to 19.75 inches thick and can be checked for cracks, corrosion, etc. and fixed while these cannisters at San Onofre can't be checked or fixed is asking for a catastrophe beyond one's wildest nightmare. If one were drawing up a plan to destroy not just southern California but the United States and cause a global economic depression as well as incredible genetic damage to humans, animals and plants you couldn't have come up with a more insidious plan. Do NOT allow this. Get all the waste into the thickest cannisters possible that are able to be checked for damage and fixed and do not bury it in the beach 108 feet [for now, less as climate change brings the oceans closer] from the Ocean, inches from high tides [for now].
-
824. Name: Kate Bell on 2017-10-23 21:21:21
Comments:
-
825. Name: Noz Cavan on 2017-10-23 21:24:25
Comments:
-
826. Name: Dianne Lane on 2017-10-23 21:39:16
Comments:
-
827. Name: Joseph M Tully on 2017-10-23 22:57:05
Comments: Please help us preserve our beaches and coastline from becoming a repository for nuclear waste!
-
828. Name: Carol Huntsman on 2017-10-24 01:11:30
Comments:
-
829. Name: Molly Huddleston on 2017-10-24 04:29:48
Comments:
-
830. Name: Marc Pilisuk on 2017-10-24 06:22:51

Comments:

831. Name: Anita Dutt on 2017-10-24 12:20:53
Comments:

832. Name: Dan Fullerton on 2017-10-24 12:41:50
Comments:

833. Name: steve beck on 2017-10-24 16:59:14
Comments:

834. Name: Maureen Roy on 2017-10-24 17:01:19
Comments: These canisters must be regularly monitored forever.

835. Name: Scott Pearce on 2017-10-24 17:41:51
Comments: We need a safer approach to nuclear waste storage.

836. Name: chris johnston on 2017-10-24 17:43:34
Comments:

837. Name: Jim Sigafoos on 2017-10-24 20:02:41
Comments: Doesn't the Japanese experience prove how unwise it is to store nuclear waste in an ocean contingent facility in an earthquake/Tsunami zone?

838. Name: Skip Shaputnic on 2017-10-24 20:50:18
Comments:

839. Name: Daniel Weidner on 2017-10-24 21:19:13
Comments: I do not believe that the nuclear waste at San Onofre is adequately protected for extended storage and should be moved. The protective containers of this material are nearing the end of their useful, and safe, life.

840. Name: Michael Conlon on 2017-10-25 00:12:09
Comments:

841. Name: Barbara Meserve on 2017-10-25 17:07:55
Comments:

842. Name: Dan Moore on 2017-10-25 18:05:34
Comments: REVOKE Nuclear Waste Storage Permit at San Onofre

843. Name: Stephanie A Thom on 2017-10-25 18:19:42

Comments: The health and safety of residents is in jeopardy, how is this even being considered? Disgusted with our elected representatives.

844. Name: Jeanne Schuster on 2017-10-25 20:59:58
Comments:

845. Name: Louis Deneau on 2017-10-25 22:31:15
Comments: Nuclear waste storage must be conducted in a manner to optimize public safety over the full term of storage. This is an unacceptable plan.

846. Name: Ann Carli on 2017-10-26 04:02:00
Comments:

847. Name: JOHN W MULLENDER on 2017-10-26 08:08:38
Comments:

848. Name: Eileen Mahood-Jose on 2017-10-26 14:27:49
Comments:

849. Name: Michael Sall on 2017-10-26 17:00:17
Comments:

850. Name: Cindy Berg on 2017-10-27 02:23:51
Comments: UNBELIEVABLE!!!! MOVE THE CANISTER'S TO THE DESERT NOW!!!

851. Name: Stacy gavin on 2017-10-27 02:26:53
Comments:

852. Name: Alan Korsen on 2017-10-27 02:41:17
Comments:

853. Name: Jose Caballero on 2017-10-27 03:52:10
Comments:

854. Name: Deborah Schlesinger on 2017-10-27 03:58:20
Comments: Please resolve this potentially dangerous situation..

855. Name: gordon globus on 2017-10-27 04:05:10
Comments:

856. Name: Libby Shackford on 2017-10-27 11:26:42
Comments:

-
857. Name: Linda Leventhal Gotskind on 2017-10-27 13:49:01
Comments:
-
858. Name: ANNE KELLY on 2017-10-27 14:27:00
Comments:
-
859. Name: Rachel Kelts on 2017-10-27 14:31:47
Comments:
-
860. Name: Anja Tapias on 2017-10-27 15:46:42
Comments:
-
861. Name: Shail Powers on 2017-10-27 16:28:21
Comments:
-
862. Name: Leah Vasquez on 2017-10-27 16:31:06
Comments:
-
863. Name: Barbara Rathbun on 2017-10-27 16:39:02
Comments:
-
864. Name: ann feeney on 2017-10-27 16:52:32
Comments:
-
865. Name: Steve Tollefsrud on 2017-10-27 17:03:04
Comments:
-
866. Name: Corinne Suveges on 2017-10-27 17:35:19
Comments:
-
867. Name: Pam Patterson on 2017-10-27 18:58:14
Comments: Edison has had more than 54 years to responsibly resolve the issue of where and how to store this nuclear waste. Just one more example of the mismanagement and incredibly cavalier attitude SCE, the CPUC, and the NRC have with respect to our welfare. The Coastal Commission needs to do the right thing here, and revoke the permit; and this nuclear waste needs to be properly stored, i.e., in the 10" canisters!
-
868. Name: Gary Jenkins on 2017-10-27 21:49:02
Comments:
-
869. Name: Marguerite Winkel on 2017-10-27 22:28:37

Comments:

870. Name: Cecile Donath on 2017-10-27 23:57:40
Comments:

871. Name: Marla Thrift on 2017-10-28 02:57:39
Comments:

872. Name: Jerry Spets on 2017-10-28 03:18:49
Comments:

873. Name: chris Lamont on 2017-10-28 06:08:23
Comments: Please take this somewhere else that is more appropriate and safe !!! Keep this away from our beautiful beaches and residential areas where people can be harmed.

874. Name: Aleana Lamont on 2017-10-28 06:24:01
Comments:

875. Name: Devra Rossi on 2017-10-28 08:12:11
Comments:

876. Name: Candice letter on 2017-10-28 13:37:22
Comments: Do damn dangerous! Don't store it by the sea wall!!!!

877. Name: Nancy French on 2017-10-28 16:41:17
Comments:

878. Name: Kathleen Selevan on 2017-10-28 16:47:20
Comments:

879. Name: Kimberly Lefner on 2017-10-28 17:21:47
Comments: Please revoke SCE's permit to bury nuclear waste within feet of the ocean.

880. Name: Lesley Donnell on 2017-10-28 18:48:48
Comments:

881. Name: barbara and steve szemenyei on 2017-10-28 21:02:13
Comments:

882. Name: Sharon and Michael Cole on 2017-10-29 00:10:12
Comments:

883. Name: RBruce Denney on 2017-10-29 16:01:02
Comments:
-
884. Name: Alvin Ehrig Jr on 2017-10-29 19:19:10
Comments:
-
885. Name: Michael Laux on 2017-10-29 19:35:41
Comments:
-
886. Name: Janice Bernard on 2017-10-29 19:48:40
Comments:
-
887. Name: Ana Alvarez on 2017-10-29 22:10:51
Comments:
-
888. Name: Donna Fleming on 2017-10-29 22:39:34
Comments:
-
889. Name: PJ Douglas on 2017-10-29 23:15:33
Comments: NO, NO, NO to burying nuclear waste at San Onofre Beach. One good storm and it will be all over.
-
890. Name: Patricia Plumb on 2017-10-30 01:08:54
Comments:
-
891. Name: Diana Eagan on 2017-10-30 04:22:48
Comments: Bad-in every conceivable way.
Protect the people..protect the oceans. Put safety first.
-
892. Name: Lyle Barkley on 2017-10-30 14:37:14
Comments:
-
893. Name: jack and margaret dobson on 2017-10-30 16:49:57
Comments:
-
894. Name: monica romero on 2017-10-30 18:49:44
Comments:
-
895. Name: Chris Catsimanes on 2017-10-31 13:22:32
Comments:
-
896. Name: Joseph R Thompson on 2017-10-31 14:13:53

Comments:

-
897. Name: Sally Barron on 2017-10-31 14:24:05
Comments: Temporary storage containers at the edge of the ocean are a disaster waiting to happen,
-
898. Name: Lougene Anderson on 2017-10-31 14:33:20
Comments: Please carefully review all the facts and I think you will come to the same conclusion: the thin canisters approved for San Onofre are inadequate and extremely dangerous.
-
899. Name: James Mulcare on 2017-10-31 14:58:53
Comments:
-
900. Name: Barbara Gildner on 2017-10-31 16:06:06
Comments:
-
901. Name: Raul Ferreira on 2017-10-31 16:18:37
Comments:
-
902. Name: Angelique Strahan on 2017-10-31 17:09:30
Comments:
-
903. Name: Stella STEPHENS on 2017-10-31 17:35:59
Comments: Calif. is ground zero for quakes...it's insane that nuclear power plants were even built here...let alone after decommissioning SONGS that Edison is being allowed to "store" the nuclear waste in thin-walled containers INCAPABLE OF SUSTAINING CONTAINMENT due to cracking, etc.
-
904. Name: Cynthia Voigt on 2017-10-31 17:36:28
Comments:
-
905. Name: Elaine Echenique on 2017-10-31 18:19:50
Comments: Secure safety for San Clemente! Nuclear waste should not be stored near our community!
-
906. Name: Roberto Brutocao on 2017-10-31 19:16:01
Comments:
-
907. Name: Barrett Miller on 2017-10-31 20:50:29
Comments: San Onofre State Beach is my home away from home she doesn't deserve to be treated like this. How would you like it if someone just decided to take a shit on your property!!!

-
908. Name: Shahrokh Mirjahangir on 2017-10-31 23:32:54
Comments: Do the right thing. No Permit without safety for our beloved Gold Coast and its residence
-
909. Name: COLLEEN ALEXIOU on 2017-10-31 23:44:35
Comments:
-
910. Name: Diane Beeny on 2017-11-01 01:46:52
Comments:
-
911. Name: chris johnston on 2017-11-01 01:51:00
Comments:
-
912. Name: Judith Ann Swanick on 2017-11-01 03:40:00
Comments:
-
913. Name: Kimberly Wiley on 2017-11-01 06:20:08
Comments:
-
914. Name: Junko ABe on 2017-11-01 10:00:10
Comments: I am a Japanese woman. As California and other US West Coast suffered Fukushima accident, we in Japan will also suffer damage on our side of the Pacific in the possible event of Nclear Waste Storage Facility at San Onofre.
-
915. Name: kim stanick on 2017-11-01 13:32:20
Comments:
-
916. Name: Tiffany Atkinson on 2017-11-01 15:19:21
Comments:
-
917. Name: Anne Crawford on 2017-11-01 15:41:07
Comments:
-
918. Name: Laura Donovan on 2017-11-01 16:30:53
Comments:
-
919. Name: Valerie Moodie on 2017-11-01 16:33:33
Comments: It is a huge nuclear accident waiting to happen given the dangers here
-
920. Name: Michelle montgomery on 2017-11-01 18:25:25
Comments:
-

-
921. Name: Scott Atkinson on 2017-11-01 18:42:15
Comments: Storage of this waste is not being done safely. A leak would cut off transportation at a crucial North- South artery.
-
922. Name: Miki Bay on 2017-11-01 20:06:19
Comments:
-
923. Name: erin yarrobino on 2017-11-01 20:57:30
Comments:
-
924. Name: Margaret Elliott on 2017-11-01 21:14:07
Comments:
-
925. Name: linda fiorelli on 2017-11-01 23:08:36
Comments: Federal government, keep your promise to ship this waste to a unpopulated site, ie yucca mountain.
-
926. Name: Jodi on 2017-11-01 23:44:06
Comments:
-
927. Name: Robert McCormick on 2017-11-02 13:17:09
Comments:
-
928. Name: Susan Sayre on 2017-11-02 13:27:22
Comments:
-
929. Name: Arthur and Jean Manoogian on 2017-11-02 13:40:50
Comments: Please consider the options presented as the consequences are enormous.
-
930. Name: lisa uhrhammer on 2017-11-02 13:42:31
Comments: The investors should be responsible for the waste and the cost to move the waste and pay for its storage for perpetuity.
-
931. Name: Paul Fisher on 2017-11-02 13:52:28
Comments: The long term aspects of storage make no sense. WE need to move this from the coast.
-
932. Name: Nina Babiarz on 2017-11-02 13:55:36
Comments:
-
933. Name: Jean Auris on 2017-11-02 14:14:55

Comments: This must be revoked for our health and life.

934. Name: Erik Husoe on 2017-11-02 14:30:02
Comments:

935. Name: Linda Rushing on 2017-11-02 14:48:55
Comments: Buy San Onofre get the property out of the hands of the government! They are stalling Buy San Onofre it worked for Laguna Canyon!

936. Name: Athena Murphy on 2017-11-02 15:08:37
Comments:

937. Name: Victoria MacBain on 2017-11-02 15:17:32
Comments:

938. Name: Danny Gray on 2017-11-02 15:24:55
Comments:

939. Name: barbara on 2017-11-02 15:36:52
Comments:

940. Name: Janice Frye on 2017-11-02 15:36:59
Comments:

941. Name: rosemarie button on 2017-11-02 15:46:38
Comments:

942. Name: Richard Northrop on 2017-11-02 15:55:53
Comments:

943. Name: Jack Eidt on 2017-11-02 15:57:57
Comments:

944. Name: Richard Northrop on 2017-11-02 15:58:37
Comments:

945. Name: Amy Steinberg on 2017-11-02 16:00:21
Comments:

946. Name: Ross Teasley on 2017-11-02 16:07:46
Comments:

947. Name: nikki mcdonald on 2017-11-02 16:12:23
Comments:
-
948. Name: Patricia Brumfield on 2017-11-02 16:18:18
Comments: This storage plan is dangerous and UNACCEPTABLE! Reject it now.
-
949. Name: Janice Burstin on 2017-11-02 16:18:59
Comments: DO NOT BURY RADIOACTIVE WASTE STORAGE IN CONTAINERS THAT MAY NOT CONTAIN THAT WASTE!!!!!!
-
950. Name: Tiffany Mohr on 2017-11-02 16:24:33
Comments:
-
951. Name: Mike Tiffany on 2017-11-02 16:25:18
Comments:
-
952. Name: mike uhrhammer on 2017-11-02 16:26:32
Comments: Don't increase the risk of nuclear waste polluting our ocean -- slowly and unseen for decades. Minimize it.
-
953. Name: Dorrie robles on 2017-11-02 16:34:59
Comments: No, this is dangerous to our ecosystem. Our oceans are sacred...
-
954. Name: Sherie Stark on 2017-11-02 16:35:08
Comments: This mishandling of the public trust is horrendous, and it affects not only the South Bay area and all of Southern California; it affects the whole planet!
-
955. Name: barbara and steve szemenyi on 2017-11-02 16:44:35
Comments:
-
956. Name: Janice Burstin on 2017-11-02 16:49:17
Comments: DO NOT BURY RADIOACTIVE WASTE IN INCOMPETENT CANNISTERS!!!!!!
-
957. Name: Myphon Hunt on 2017-11-02 17:01:29
Comments:
-
958. Name: Brenda Gaines on 2017-11-02 17:01:51
Comments:
-
959. Name: Donna Larner Lavery on 2017-11-02 17:10:51
Comments:
-

960. Name: Ethan Swan on 2017-11-02 17:21:05
Comments:

961. Name: Laurel Kaskurs on 2017-11-02 18:05:05
Comments: Why must San Onofre's owners continuously put profits before human health? I know it might seem off topic, but I feel compelled to point out another example of profits over safety which happened before the shut down: Read the highlighted parts of these two articles and it will be clear:

atomicinsights.com/san-onofre-steam-generators-honest-error-driven-by-search-for-perfection/

If Unit 3 had remained in operation, other tubes in the same area of the steam generator would have likely failed. The same problem does not exist in Unit 2.

<https://www.google.com/amp/www.ocregister.com/2013/09/24/nrc-blames-mitsubishi-for-san-onofre-failure/amp/>

The NRC said the error in Mitsubishi's model had a long history. Mitsubishi originally had developed the computer code in 1978 for one kind of steam generator, then modified it in 1992 for another. But the 1992 modification, used for San Onofre and four other nuclear plants, contained a flaw, according to the NRC notice to Mitsubishi.

However, of the five plants whose generators were designed using the model, only San Onofre failed.

If the design flaw in Unit 3 was not in Unit 2, that means Unit 2's steam generators were from before 1992 and therefore NOT NEW when they were SUPPOSEDLY replaced in 2009. And then Unit 3's were so crappy that they could not even make it a couple of years. That is why the wear in the tubes of Unit 2 was so "unprecedented" and, apparently, the Kobe Steel plates of Unit 3 which went between the tubes came loose during testing and the copper alloy in the tubes was substandard grade as well.

So, they have no problem using cracked steam generators with poor quality Kobe Steel and copper alloys. How are we to trust that these canisters will be of decent quality given the facts that San Onofre has a long and sordid history of doing things on the cheap? How can we trust that they did not pick up these waste canisters at the nuclear flea market? These are probably unsafe for transport already. I hope Holtec does not buy from Mitsubishi because Kobe Steel products are their sole supplier and they are recalling just about everything.

If you bury this crap on the beach, you are committing random slow murder on future generations. There is no nicer way I can put that. I agree with Gary Seadrick that we must buy the highest quality containers and let this waste cool down adequately while we use that time to apply only the best technology to our dilemma.

962. Name: Deborah Reed on 2017-11-02 18:18:47
Comments:

963. Name: Anna Marc on 2017-11-02 18:20:53
Comments:
-
964. Name: Kimberly Santore on 2017-11-02 18:34:24
Comments:
-
965. Name: Elisa Crawford Harris on 2017-11-02 18:35:43
Comments:
-
966. Name: Marjie Schlegel on 2017-11-02 19:18:21
Comments:
-
967. Name: Alex Fierro-Clarke on 2017-11-02 19:36:23
Comments:
-
968. Name: Austin Hurwitz on 2017-11-02 19:39:38
Comments:
-
969. Name: Rita on 2017-11-02 19:52:56
Comments: Waste storage should be addressed properly. Reasonable and safe requirements are imperative.
-
970. Name: Leslie Cassidy on 2017-11-02 19:58:36
Comments:
-
971. Name: andee shill on 2017-11-02 20:28:53
Comments: stop it
-
972. Name: Terri Wiley on 2017-11-02 20:30:35
Comments:
-
973. Name: Victoria Korosei on 2017-11-02 20:39:14
Comments: Preserve our planet and our future - you know very well what that stuff can do to living organisms.
-
974. Name: Lisa Seipel on 2017-11-02 20:41:43
Comments:
-
975. Name: barbara and steve szemenyei on 2017-11-02 20:56:07
Comments:
-
976. Name: Susan Willhoit on 2017-11-02 21:02:22

Comments: 10" to 19.75" think walls, PLEASE....THINK about our future generations...like your children, grandchildren etc., etc., etc.

977. Name: Tony Fiorelli on 2017-11-02 21:19:48
Comments:

978. Name: Lori Boehm on 2017-11-02 21:28:42
Comments:

979. Name: Jeffrey Erbs on 2017-11-02 21:36:14
Comments:

980. Name: David Lopes on 2017-11-02 21:39:09
Comments: Who makes these kind of decisions, what is wrong with you people?

981. Name: Lisa Kopelman on 2017-11-02 21:40:01
Comments: please do not attire nuclear waste at San Onofre Beach. This is extremely dangerous due to risk of earthquake and the proximity to a densely populated community (San Clemente & Orange County).

982. Name: Jo Kenney on 2017-11-02 21:55:42
Comments: Please do not store nuclear waste at San Onofre. If nuclear technology cannot figure out how to deal with waste, they should not create it in the first place. The storage canisters being used at San Onofre cannot be inspected, repaired, maintained, monitored, or transported without cracks. This is unacceptable. We will all pay the cost if these flawed canisters are used.

983. Name: Mimi Wolin on 2017-11-02 21:59:19
Comments: Do not bury nuclear waste!!

984. Name: kingsley osborn on 2017-11-02 22:20:50
Comments:

985. Name: Craig Barry on 2017-11-02 22:39:22
Comments:

986. Name: Libbe HaLevy on 2017-11-02 22:44:25
Comments: ARE YOU OUT OF YOUR MINDS? This is an insane, avoidable risk. Think ahead! Use canisters that can be inspected, repaired, maintained, monitored and transported without cracks.

987. Name: Kelly Merrick on 2017-11-02 22:52:38
Comments:

-
988. Name: mary goldman on 2017-11-02 23:16:11
Comments:
-
989. Name: Annika on 2017-11-02 23:37:12
Comments:
-
990. Name: Mark Glasser on 2017-11-02 23:39:15
Comments: let's use common sense
-
991. Name: Kevin Higgins on 2017-11-03 00:02:53
Comments:
-
992. Name: Jere Licciardello on 2017-11-03 00:16:53
Comments:
-
993. Name: chris johnston on 2017-11-03 00:39:54
Comments:
-
994. Name: Joe Hiney on 2017-11-03 00:44:44
Comments: Stop the insanity. Stop killing
-
995. Name: Kenneth Gibson on 2017-11-03 00:53:46
Comments: 1. Please stop creating nuclear waste anywhere. 2. Please don't store nuclear waste near the ocean or any freshwater resource. 3. Use the safest containment system imaginable at the expense of shareholders who have profited during the life of the nuclear power plant.
-
996. Name: ronnie theroux on 2017-11-03 00:58:23
Comments:
-
997. Name: Todd Schoedel on 2017-11-03 01:27:26
Comments: This is insane storing Nuclear Waste at San Onofre, nearly in the water
-
998. Name: Kent Rone on 2017-11-03 01:48:58
Comments:
-
999. Name: Henry Peters on 2017-11-03 02:04:03
Comments: Any thing short of realistic LONG TERM vision, is NOT satisfactory resolution (no real solution to nuclear wastes, except not to make it in the first place...).

Constant supervision, adequate containment according to the hazardous life of the isotopes so contained). Not to mention potential geological event, etc..

-
1000. Name: Constance Boone on 2017-11-03 02:08:18
Comments:
-
1001. Name: Ann Dorsey on 2017-11-03 03:46:13
Comments:
-
1002. Name: Swedina Hurt on 2017-11-03 03:50:54
Comments:
-
1003. Name: Karen Berger on 2017-11-03 03:55:12
Comments:
-
1004. Name: jamie jung on 2017-11-03 04:41:45
Comments:
-
1005. Name: Nancy Barcellona on 2017-11-03 08:16:56
Comments:
-
1006. Name: Tom Kortkamp on 2017-11-03 08:26:39
Comments:
-
1007. Name: JoDell Christensen on 2017-11-03 14:34:52
Comments:
-
1008. Name: Betty Lee on 2017-11-03 14:39:08
Comments:
-
1009. Name: Faith Boucher on 2017-11-03 14:55:39
Comments:
-
1010. Name: Philip Petrie on 2017-11-03 15:56:50
Comments:
-
1011. Name: Sandy Barnett on 2017-11-03 16:05:49
Comments:
-
1012. Name: Morgan Wilkerson on 2017-11-03 16:23:15
Comments:
-
1013. Name: R Vinci on 2017-11-03 17:05:30
Comments:
-

-
1014. Name: Micah Marshall on 2017-11-03 17:45:30
Comments:
-
1015. Name: Margaret Bruno on 2017-11-03 18:07:24
Comments: Get the waste out to the desert disposal where it belongs. Bury it on our coastline? Trust them to do it right? Ignorant!
-
1016. Name: Maria Simmons on 2017-11-03 19:48:44
Comments: Lets get it done!
-
1017. Name: Richard Cromie on 2017-11-03 21:19:52
Comments:
-
1018. Name: Elizabeth Holmes on 2017-11-03 21:23:51
Comments:
-
1019. Name: Kelly rients on 2017-11-03 23:25:50
Comments:
-
1020. Name: Carolyn Bolton on 2017-11-04 00:11:33
Comments: No!
-
1021. Name: Barbara Johnson on 2017-11-04 01:35:31
Comments:
-
1022. Name: Jennifer Pardinias on 2017-11-04 01:52:28
Comments:
-
1023. Name: Gene Stone on 2017-11-04 03:20:50
Comments:
-
1024. Name: Christine Becker on 2017-11-04 04:02:31
Comments: Put it in a more suitable place, this is not safe.
-
1025. Name: Mitch Panek on 2017-11-04 19:04:08
Comments: steel cask too thin, too many assemblies per cask. Criticality analysis ? Too close to water for corrosion and criticality.
-
1026. Name: john thomas on 2017-11-04 22:55:26
Comments:
-

1027. Name: Kent Johnson on 2017-11-05 04:20:10
Comments:
-
1028. Name: Romi Elnagar on 2017-11-05 05:38:19
Comments: Start caring about the people of this state, and not the monied interests!!!!
-
1029. Name: Jason Berteotti on 2017-11-05 06:19:07
Comments:
-
1030. Name: Sam Friedman on 2017-11-05 09:32:15
Comments:
-
1031. Name: Amy Harlib on 2017-11-05 12:42:09
Comments: SHUT DOWN ALL NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS AND GO SOLAR AND WIND POWER!
-
1032. Name: TC R on 2017-11-05 13:33:30
Comments:
-
1033. Name: John Costello on 2017-11-05 16:42:24
Comments:
-
1034. Name: Ellen Thomas on 2017-11-05 17:15:06
Comments:
-
1035. Name: Patricia Akers on 2017-11-05 17:29:19
Comments: It is time for the people of San Diego and Orange County to not be under the thumb of this old and tired nuclear plant ! Too many times OUR lives were mitigated. No more.
-
1036. Name: Marlene Metcalf on 2017-11-05 17:34:45
Comments:
-
1037. Name: Cynthia Papermaster on 2017-11-05 17:53:24
Comments:
-
1038. Name: David Lopes on 2017-11-05 19:28:31
Comments:
-
1039. Name: Patricia McArdle on 2017-11-05 20:54:39
Comments: The California coastline on a fault line is not a safe storage place for spent nuclear fuel.
-

1040. Name: Wythe Holt on 2017-11-05 21:17:10
Comments:

1041. Name: Citizen Voter on 2017-11-05 22:30:17
Comments: NO! NO! NO!

1042. Name: Terri Wiley on 2017-11-06 01:26:45
Comments: This is so very sad.

1043. Name: Leslie Cassidy on 2017-11-06 01:27:10
Comments:

1044. Name: Robert Broska on 2017-11-06 05:07:20
Comments: Not on an earthquake fault, For God sake!

1045. Name: Timothy E Starbright on 2017-11-06 05:29:34
Comments:

1046. Name: Kassy Clem on 2017-11-06 05:35:22
Comments: All this debris needs to be neutralized immediately!

1047. Name: michael murphy on 2017-11-06 05:59:32
Comments: stop the insanity

1048. Name: Eva Kerckhove on 2017-11-06 13:48:47
Comments:

1049. Name: Judith Ann Swanick on 2017-11-06 14:01:41
Comments:

1050. Name: Nancy McLaughlin on 2017-11-06 16:32:21
Comments: Nuclear waste should never be stored next to the Pacific Ocean. This is not an issue to be decided by a dollar bottom line.

1051. Name: Gaetan Chevalier on 2017-11-06 16:47:56
Comments:
