

WCO Outreach CEm Resource

From: liquidbread@juno.com
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2012 1:05 PM
To: WCO Outreach Resource
Subject: spent fuel storage

As i understand the spent fuel storage situation as it applies to the power plant nearby my family's home: the Pilgrim license amendment permitted 3,859 assemblies in its pool elevated spent fuel pool outside primary containment. A license renewal will generate ½ again as much.

In light of the disaster largely revolving around unsafe spent fuel storage in Japan, how can any reasonable person consider spent fuel storage to be safe at all, never mind in exponentially larger and tighter quantities than at Fukushima? Does the expense of dry cask storage REALLY outweigh the interest of public safety. Isn't public safety supposed to be the primary mandate of the NRC. Or, has the NRC really become nothing more than a lobbyist for the nuclear industry? Many past and recent stories seem to indicate the latter - including the recent infighting of pro-industry commissioners and the seemingly more public conscious director. Also, where does the 200 year number come from? Finally, has the NRC EVER denied (or even delayed) re permitting extensions for ANY nuclear power plant - ever?

sincerely concerned,

James Concannon
Plymouth, MA

Federal Register Notice: 99FR99992
Comment Number: 10

Mail Envelope Properties (20120116.130452.23307.0)

Subject: spent fuel storage
Sent Date: 1/16/2012 1:04:52 PM
Received Date: 1/16/2012 1:06:27 PM
From: liquidbread@juno.com

Created By: liquidbread@juno.com

Recipients:
"WCO outreach Resource" <WCO outreach.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: webmail09.vgs.unttd.com

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1148	1/16/2012 1:06:27 PM

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