



Document Details

Docket ID:	DOE-HQ-2017-0004
Docket Title:	Requests for Information: Approaches Involving Private Initiatives for Consolidated Interim Storage Facilities *
Document File:	
Docket Phase:	Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPR)
Phase Sequence:	1
Original Document ID:	DOE_FRDOC_0001-DRAFT-0481
Current Document ID:	DOE-HQ-2017-0004-DRAFT-0012
Title:	Comment on FR Doc # 2016-26018
Number of Attachments:	0
Document Type:	PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS *
Document Subtype:	Public Comment
Comment on Document ID:	DOE-HQ-2017-0004-0001
Comment on Document Title:	Requests for Information: Approaches Involving Private Initiatives for Consolidated Interim Storage Facilities
Status:	Pending_Post
Received Date:	01/27/2017 *
Date Posted:	
Posting Restriction:	No restrictions
Submission Type:	Web
Number of Submissions:	1 *

Document Optional Details

Submitter Info

Comment:	Response to RFI on Private Initiatives to Develop Consolidated SNF Storage Facilities It is a waste of time and effort to try to site an "interim" radioactive waste storage site. It would be far more effective to try to find a safe permanent storage site. The big problem with "interim" sites is that they can effectively become permanent even though they are not safe. It will take immense political will to site any radioactive waste site and once an "interim" site is found there is little likelihood that there will be enough political will to find a safe permanent site. There are other difficulties with an "interim" site such as the fact that moving waste more than
-----------------	--

once will at least double the potential for accidents and terrorist attacks. Also, "interim" facilities are less likely to have adequate protection against environmental and terrorist threats than a permanent site. Based on my own experience in helping to try to site a radioactive waste facility there is a great temptation to "bribe" poor rural communities with economic rewards rather than trying to construct a waste facility in the safest manner possible. This is likely to be a significant factor in any private "interim" site selection. Safety must be the first consideration not an afterthought once an "apparently" willing poor rural community is found. Perhaps most important, it is foolish to continue producing these radioactive wastes until there is a truly safe way to permanently store them. The provision of "interim" storage will only make it more difficult to provide a long term solution to the problems of radioactive waste production. "Interim" storage sites will only add to the problem of safeguarding radioactive wastes. *🌐

First Name: Ernest *🌐

Middle Name: 🌐

Last Name: Fuller *🌐

Mailing Address: 1427 Kearney Hill Rd *🌐

Mailing Address 2: . *🌐

City: Six Mile Run *🌐

Country: United States 🌐

State or Province: Pennsylvania 🌐

ZIP/Postal Code: 16679 *🌐

Email Address: 🌐

Phone Number: 🌐


Fax Number: 🌐

Organization Name: 🌐

Submitter's Representative: 🌐

Government Agency Type: 🌐

Government Agency: 🌐

Cover Page: 

Document Optional Details

Status Set Date: 02/13/2017

Current Assignee: Bacon, Cuttie (DOE)

Status Set By: Freeman, Yohanna (DOE)

Comment Start Date: 


Comment Due Date: 

Legacy ID:

Tracking Number: 1k1-8ueg-doxs 

**Total Page Count
Including Attachments:** 1

Submitter Info


Comment: Response to RFI on Private Initiatives to Develop Consolidated SNF Storage Facilities It is a waste of time and effort to try to site an "interim" radioactive waste storage site. It would be far more effective to try to find a safe permanent storage site. The big problem with "interim" sites is that they can effectively become permanent even though they are not safe. It will take immense political will to site any radioactive waste site and once an "interim" site is found there is little likelihood that there will be enough political will to find a safe permanent site. There are other difficulties with an "interim" site such as the fact that moving waste more than once will at least double the potential for accidents and terrorist attacks. Also, "interim" facilities are less likely to have adequate protection against environmental and terrorist threats than a permanent site. Based on my own experience in helping to try to site a radioactive waste facility there is a great temptation to "bribe" poor rural communities with economic rewards rather than trying to construct a waste facility in the safest manner possible. This is likely to be a significant factor in any private "interim" site selection. Safety must be the first consideration not an afterthought once an "apparently" willing poor rural community is found. Perhaps most important, it is foolish to continue producing these radioactive wastes until there is a truly safe way to permanently store them. The provision of "interim" storage will only make it more difficult to provide a long term solution to the problems of radioactive waste production. "Interim" storage sites will only add to the problem of safeguarding radioactive wastes. *

First Name: Ernest *

Middle Name: 

Last Name: Fuller *

Mailing Address: 1427 Kearney Hill Rd *


Mailing Address 2: . *


City: Six Mile Run *

Country: United States 

State or Province: Pennsylvania 

ZIP/Postal Code: 16679 * 

Email Address: 

Phone Number: 

Fax Number: 

Organization Name: 

**Submitter's
Representative:** 

Government Agency Type: 

Government Agency: 

Cover Page: 