

## CCNPPEISCommentsResource

---

**From:** Stephen Rosenblum [rosenblum@cyberonic.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 12, 2008 12:16 AM  
**To:** CalvertCliffsCOLAEIS Resource  
**Subject:** Comments on the EIS Scoping Process

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is at the commencement of considering several proposals for new nuclear reactors- the first wave of new reactors proposals in nearly three decades. As the NRC moves forward in the licensing process through the preparation of Environmental Impacts Statements, I urge to fully consider the impacts of nuclear waste.

The Nuclear Waste Confidence Decision provides little solace to the nuclear waste management issue. In the nearly thirty years since the decision was issued we have gotten no closer to licensing a geologic repository. In the meanwhile, high-level radioactive waste is mounting up at 104 reactors sites throughout the country. If the nuclear industry wants to seriously consider moving forward with a new generation of nuclear reactors, then the true cost of waste issues must be evaluated accordingly.

Therefore:

The Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) should fully address the potential consequences of permanent storage of high-level radioactive waste. Because there is no permanent storage facility for high-level radioactive waste, and it appears increasingly unlikely that there will be one during the lifetime of a new generation of reactors, the EIS should address how and where all of the high-level radioactive waste will be stored.

The EIS should address potential consequences of a serious accident in the irradiated fuel pool at new sites and in other potential high-level radioactive waste storage facilities.

The EIS should address the possible effects of new reactors on existing dry cask irradiated fuel storage units at the plant, including their potential degradation over time as well as the potential impacts of a large expansion of the dry cask units to store high-level radioactive waste from new reactors.

The EIS should address possible effects of transportation of radioactive waste generated at the sites, in the unlikely event a waste repository ever will be built. This should include road, rail and barge transportation.

We cannot begin to consider the expansion of nuclear power, while the issues of the previous generation remain unresolved. Thank you for your consideration.

Stephen Rosenblum  
212 Santa Rita Ave  
212 Santa Rita Ave  
Palo Alto, CA 94301

**Federal Register Notice:** 73FR8719  
**Comment Number:** 146

**Mail Envelope Properties** (24400764.1207973780568.JavaMail.root)

**Subject:** Comments on the EIS Scoping Process  
**Sent Date:** 4/12/2008 12:16:20 AM  
**Received Date:** 4/12/2008 12:16:22 AM  
**From:** Stephen Rosenblum

**Created By:** rosenblum@cyberonic.com

**Recipients:**  
"CalvertCliffsCOLAEIS Resource" <CalvertCliffs.Resource@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** web2.mcl.wiredforchange.com

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2268	4/12/2008 12:16:22 AM

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