

<b>As of:</b> 4/24/20 10:11 AM <b>Received:</b> April 23, 2020 <b>Status:</b> Pending_Post <b>Tracking No.</b> 1k4-9gan-g4y2 <b>Comments Due:</b> May 04, 2020 <b>Submission Type:</b> Web
---

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

**Docket:** NRC-2019-0224

List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: TN America LLC, NUHOMS EOS Dry Spent Fuel Storage System, Certificate of Compliance No. 1042, Amendment No. 1

**Comment On:** NRC-2019-0224-0001

List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: TN Americas LLC NUHOMS EOS Dry Spent Fuel Storage System, Certificate of Compliance No. 1042, Amendment No. 1; Direct Final Rule

**Document:** NRC-2019-0224-DRAFT-0007

Comment on FR Doc # 2020-06662

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Brian Arthur

---

## General Comment

In regards to Nuclear Regulatory Commissions, I would like to begin by commending the NRC on taking action to further ensure safety measures in the field of nuclear power. Nuclear power is still seen by many as an unstable and unsafe source of power, despite it being clean and reliable. The measures taken by the NRC to minimize potential failures in this rule are all well thought out and clear, and will likely work for the foreseeable future, in my opinion.

I would like to start my praises with the actions taken to mitigate the potential environmental hazards, referenced by section 8 of the rule description. I have to say, I am amazed by the confidence the NRC has in the new containment casks, the new basket types. To be confident in its ability to withstand an earthquake or tornado is very impressive. However, I have to bring up a concern that many scientists have, that the dry casks implemented by the rule are a near-term solution, and that they aren't used for long term storage, only until the waste is cool enough to be moved to permanent storage. The rule document does not specify what is to be

done with the waste when it has run its course in the casks, and thus I have to wonder if the permanent holding cells will undergo the same level of reform that the dry casks did.

Another issue I found was the lack of description in some of the subsections, namely subsections E and F of section 8. The lack of detail in what the shift of recourse use would entail is a little worrying, despite the fact that the detail that is there states that no major commitments would be made. With the posturing about the new safety measures, and then the switch to a statement like this, it may cause worry in some that an unclear amount is being spent on this rule. I don't mean to be skeptical, but I am looking for potential issues with the rule, and the lack of detail is one of the few.

Speaking of things being unclear, one of the main reasons much of the public is wary of nuclear power is from a lack of understanding. Media portrayal of nuclear power as a ticking time bomb, something to be fearful of. Many associate nuclear power with nuclear weapons, despite the differences and the safety measure undertaken by American scientists. There is also a lack of detail in section 9, regarding the public protection notifications. The fact that the only description in this is a statement that tries to dissuade the public from accessing information is a little worrying, despite it being an accurate description that has what it needs. If an average person were to look at that description, they would probably take it that the NRC is hiding something. I would suggest being more clear with your reasoning as to why non-approved people cannot access some information, and give ways for a normal person to become more educated on the topic and try and lessen the fear that much of the public has on nuclear power.