

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 1/8/18 4:25 PM
 Received: January 02, 2018
 Status: Pending_Post
 Tracking No. 1k2-90pd-c5yj
 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-0029

Comment on FR Doc # 2017-24734

Submitter Information

Name: Jody Gibson

Address:

317 E. Wall Ave.

Des Moines, IA, 50315

Email: jodyg8@msn.com

(28)
 82 FR 52944
 11/15/2017
 SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM - 013

E-RIDS= ADM-03

Add= Jerney Smith (juss)

General Comment

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 5/8th 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 before leaks No Yes

ASME container 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