
From: N. Rice <hope247@sover.net>
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 10:25 PM
To: PrivatelSF
Subject: Response to RFI on Private Initiatives to Develop Consolidated SNF Storage Facilities

Jan. 27, 2017

To the U.S. Department of Energy:

These are my comments strenuously objecting to the proposal of using private initiatives for storing high level nuclear waste at interim storage facilities. I say this for a number of reasons, but to start with, this idea is very likely to result in disaster because private owners will be cutting costs a lot in order to increase their profits. That is the nature of private owners. If there was radioactive contamination, this could harm our water, air, land and our health for thousands of years. That would be unconscionable.

These private permanent parking lot dumps are a very high risk radiologically, but also financially to taxpayers, and although called “interim storage” facilities, they are almost certainly going to end up as permanent storage. The liability for the costs of storing commercial irradiated nuclear fuel belongs with the companies who have benefited from the generation of the electricity and not with the taxpayers.

As far as the proposed Andrews County Texas location is concerned, that location has aquifers connected with the Oglalla Aquifer which supply millions of people with their drinking water as well as water for irrigation. For heavens sake, don't even consider doing such a thing.

I am also against this proposal of using private initiatives for storing high level nuclear waste at interim storage sites because moving high level nuclear waste over highways, rails and waterways to a supposedly temporary location puts everyone along those routes in danger due to the potentially high risk of accidents, leaks or even potential terrorist attacks. To me moving the high level waste across the country is an insane idea at least until there is a deep secure underground permanent repository which could safely isolate the dangerous waste for the millions of years the waste is radioactive, assuming such a site could be found, agreed upon, and built.

Since there is not a deep underground permanent repository available, I believe that the only solution that should even be considered is to store the high level waste onsite (where the waste was generated) in solid stainless steel dry casks enclosed in concrete canisters and protected by berms against water infiltration. At this point I feel this is the only safe way to store this waste. In addition, those stainless steel casks must be many inches thick as they are in Europe, not casks which are less than an inch thick as is presently proposed by Entergy with their bargain basement casks which I understand have a ridiculous “guarantee” of only 25 years. That again is unconscionable.

For the sake of all our children and of future generations of people, I implore you to not use private initiatives to store high level nuclear waste at interim facilities. Store the waste only in hardened onsite waste storage casks and do it very carefully with experienced workmen.

Sincerely,

Nancy Rice

Randolph Center, VT 05061