

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

alice slater

446 e 86 st

ny

NY, NY 10028

From: Kris Cunningham <krissysjake@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 6:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kris Cunningham

142 Sims cir

Waynesville, NC 28786

From: Bernadette Francke <bernabob@phonewave.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 6:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bernadette Francke

5555 Rivers Edge

Fallon, NV 89406

From: Dan Hale <danhale@centurytel.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 6:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dan Hale

3939 Felicity Lane

3939 S. Felicity Lane, Columbia, Mo.

Columbia, MO 65203

From: Janet E. Smith <jes83144@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 6:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Janet E. Smith

11211 55 Avenue

11211 55 Avenue

Edmonton, AB T6H0W9

From: Bruce Raymond <original_zen@hotmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 6:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bruce Raymond

1377 Dogwood Lane

Osage Beach, MO 65065

From: Jason Roberts <jasonr240@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 6:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jason Roberts

1820 Old U.S. Hwy 40

Columbia, MO 65202

From: Greg Leech <greg.leech@att.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 5:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Greg Leech

12115 meridian ave. S #A8

Everett, WA 98208

From: Jeffrey Dickemann <dicke.mannjeff@hotmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 5:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Dickemann

2901 Humphrey Avenue

2901 Humphrey Ave.

Richmond, CA 94804

From: Debra Kness <debkness@centurylink.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 5:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Debra Kness

Columbia, MO 65202

From: Debra Hardin <maidengoat@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 5:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Debra Hardin

135 highway 00

Hallsville, MO 65255

From: Linda Seeley <lindaseeley@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 5:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Linda Seeley

1615 Tiffany Ranch Road

217 Westmont Ave

Arroyo Grande, CA 93420

From: George Lewis <glewis@calpoly.edu>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 5:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

George Lewis

1852 6th St.

Los Osos, CA 93402

From: Jean Verthein <jverthein@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 5:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable to a citizen living in the Indian Point shadow

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jean Verthein

NY, NY 10040

From: Deni jakobsberg <denise.jakobsberg@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 5:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Deni jakobsberg

4226 31st ST

mt. rainier, MD 20712

From: Genevieve Dennison <grdennison@roadrunner.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 5:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Genevieve Dennison

2785 St. Rt. 132

New Richmond, OH 45157

From: Harry DeLano <hdelano@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 5:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Harry DeLano

807 Bird Ave.

Buffalo, NY 14209

From: Elizabeth Enriquez <eenriquez@co.nye.nv.us>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 5:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Nye County Comments on Draft Nuclear Waste Administration Act 2013

Attachments: Nye County Comments on Draft Nuclear Waste Administration Act 2013.pdf

Please see attached comments from Nye County pertaining to the Draft Nuclear Waste Administration Act 2013.

Contact our office with any question or problems with attachment.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Enriquez

Administrative Secretary

Nye County NWRPO

2101 E. Calvada Blvd. Ste., 100

Pahrump, NV 89048

Direct (775) 727-3483

Office (775) 727-7727

Fax (775) 727-7919

From: Mait Alexander <mba2233@me.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 4:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mait Alexander

4175 Shawnee St

Moorpark, CA 93021

From: ANNE KILEY-PELLECHIA <annekiley@creativelinkgraphics.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 3:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

ANNE KILEY-PELLECHIA

10184 CTY RT 786

PULTENEY, NY 14874

From: Doreen McElvany <dormcelvany@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 3:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Doreen McElvany

77 Kruse Creek Rd.

49672 hidden valley trail indian wells ca 92210

Sheridan, WY 82801

From: Elisabeth Fiekowsky <lisny1@hotmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 2:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Elisabeth Fiekowsky

PO Box 2476

Sebastopol, CA 95473

From: Bruce & Virginia Pringle <pringb@comcast.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 2:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bruce & Virginia Pringle

17037 12th Pl SW

Normandy Park, WA 98166

From: MaryAnne Coyle <mcoyle1112@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 2:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

MaryAnne Coyle

457 Richmond Avenue

Buffalo, NY 14222

From: Liz Murphy <lizasmurphy@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 2:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Liz Murphy

47 Crescent Place

Monroe, CT 06468

From: Joseph Aguirre <glassspider2003@comcast.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 2:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joseph Aguirre

P.O. Box 280448

6229 10th St. N.

Oakdale, MN 55128

From: Libbe HaLevy <breezersmom@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 1:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Libbe HaLevy

7428 Valaho Dr.

Los angeles, CA 91042

From: David O'Byrne <obyrned@bellsouth.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 1:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David O'Byrne

5308 Second Street

St. Augustine, FL 32080

From: Mark Haim <mhaim@riseup.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 1:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mark Haim

1402 Richardson

Columbia, MO 65201

From: Allison Ostrer <aostrer@hotmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 1:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Instead of moving around deadly nuclear waste, stop producing it!

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Allison Ostrer

1107 E Denny Way, #C-3

2

Seattle, WA 98122

From: Hattie nestel <Hattieshalom@verizon.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 1:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Hattie nestel

athol, MA 01331

From: anita Davis <amasondavis@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 1:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

anita Davis

1190 Gilmer drive

1190 Gilmer Drive

SLC, UT 84105

From: KRISTIN SHRADER-FRECHETTE <KSHRADER@ND.EDU>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 1:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Nuclear discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dr. Maurice Shrader-Frechette

Dr. Kristin Shrader-Frechette

KRISTIN SHRADER-FRECHETTE

100 Malloy Hall

University of Notre Dame

NOTRE DAME, IN 46556

From: Beatrice Clemens <BeatriceBC@aol.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 1:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Beatrice Clemens

100 Arundel Place

St. Louis, MO 63105

From: John R. Acker <jrackertaos@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 12:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

First, Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution (found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative) would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and sustainability for the future. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John R. Acker

P.O. Box 3437

Taos, NM 87571

From: April Mondragon <etasinum@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 12:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

IT IS TIME TO STOP URANIUM MINING- STOP PRODUCING NUCLEAR WASTE, STOP NUCLEAR ENERGY- STOP POISONING THE AIR LAND AND WATER---STOP -- WAKE UP - YOU HAVE BEEN TOLD FOR OVER 50 YEARS BY THE HOPI AND OTHERS TO STOP !

STOP - WHAT WILL YOU TELL YOUR CHILDREN THAT YOU DID IN YOUR LIFE TO STOP THIS INSANITY !!!!

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

April Mondragon

HCR 74 Box 22201

Hc 74

El Prado, NM 87529

From: Charles Johnson <johnsonc20@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 12:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Charles Johnson

2206 SE Division St.

Portland, OR 97202

From: Neil Bleifeld <Procrastus@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 12:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Neil Bleifeld

405 West 48th Street, #5FE

New York, NY 10036

From: bonnie leigh <leighyoga@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 12:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

bonnie leigh

fillmore, NY 14735

From: Stephen Jordan <Stepjor@aol.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 11:46 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Stephen Jordan

9161 E Walnut Tree Dr

Tucson, AZ 85749

From: Jonnie Head <headjonnie@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 11:08 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jonnie Head

Milan, NM 87021

From: Daniela Bosenius Daniela Bosenius <mail@bosenius.info>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 10:44 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Daniela Bosenius Daniela Bosenius

Aegidiusstr.

frechen, ot 50226

From: Christopher Gaffer <rhysetux@charter.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 9:22 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radioactive Waste Discussion Draft Is Unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one is charged with protection of public health and safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly is a high-security and safety risk. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative, which would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a

temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Christopher Gaffer

412 North Broad Street

Mankato, MN 56001

From: Rick Barstow <grassrootsfuel@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 8:28 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rick Barstow

pobox 15

980 Sodom Pond Rd.

adamant, VT 05640

From: Rick Barstow <grassrootsfuel@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 8:28 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rick Barstow

pobox 15

980 Sodom Pond Rd.

adamant, VT 05640

From: Brent Williams <bcwilliams65@insightbb.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 8:27 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Brent Williams

9001 Harrods Landing Dr

Prospect, KY 40059

From: Edwin McGrath <eddie1247@animail.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 7:26 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Edwin McGrath

66 1st Avenue

Albion, PA 16401

From: Frances Smith <frances.smith@frontier.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 6:45 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Frances Smith

Dansville, NY 14437

From: Andrea Martina <witchesincorp@hotmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 5:10 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Andrea Martina

berlin, ot 10965

From: Rajka Marhold <rajka.sirca@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 4:33 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rajka Marhold

Gallusova 5

Celje, ot 3000

From: Nick Schneider <nshnei543@aol.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 2:28 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nick Schneider

4205 Roland Av.

4205 Roland Av. Bmore, MD 21210-2701

Bmore., MD 21210

From: hilary malyon <hmalyon@mindspring.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 1:11 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

hilary malyon

seminole ave

96 seminole ave

07436, NJ 07436

From: mauricio carvajal <carvaggro666@hotmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 1:11 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

mauricio carvajal

viento norte 4018

Santiago, ot 9291583

From: Sharon Levine <sdlevine@earthlink.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 1:07 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sharon Levine

2384 Boalt Ave.

Simi Valley, CA 93063

From: mauricio carvajal <carvaggro666@hotmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 12:53 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

mauricio carvajal

viento norte 4018

Santiago, ot 9291583

From: Pamela Richard <treetep@peacemail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 12:52 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Pamela Richard

61 Summerhill Ct.

Danville, CA 94526

From: richard s wilson <redneckananda@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 12:51 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

richard s wilson

1972 zehndner ave.

1972 zehndner ave.

arcata, CA 95521

From: Ruby Grad <rubygrad@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 12:47 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ruby Grad

3324 NE 47th Ave.

Portland, OR 97213

From: Katherine Miller <dgmandkm@san.rr.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 12:30 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Katherine Miller

3911 Mount Aladin Avenue

San Diego, CA 92111

From: Judy W. Soffler <judywsoffler@optonline.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 12:02 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection, and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Judy W. Soffler

8

New City, NY 10956

From: Steven Gilbert <sgilbert@innd.org>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 12:02 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Steven Gilbert

3711 47th Place NE

Seattle, WA 98105

From: Cynthia Almond <milliliter@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 11:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Almond

5046 Bent Tree Ct.

Rockford, IL 61114

From: Theresa Billeaud <theresa.billeaud@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 10:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Theresa Billeaud

515 S.W. 24th St.

504 Fern St.

San Antonio, TX 78207

From: colleen dietzel <greenstore1@juno.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 10:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

colleen dietzel

4843 B Voltaire Stl

san diego, CA 92107

From: Elizabeth Kennedy <ekennedy77721@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 9:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Please, the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems of nuclear waste.

We can't move lethal high-level radioactive waste around and increase the risks of accidents and security problems, increasing exposure to radiation along public-use highways, etc.

We need progress on a permanent solution--not a temporary and unsuitable site that would become a permanent nuclear waste dump.

I ask you to be aware that the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. Please focus your time and attention on decreasing the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Kennedy, ANP-BC

Elizabeth Kennedy

Medford, MA 02155

From: pam nelson <pamela05n@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 9:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

pam nelson

warner springs, CA 92086

From: Diana Trichilo <dtrichilo@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 8:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Diana Trichilo

450 Pitt Avenue

#3

Sebastopol, CA 95473

From: Candy LeBlanc <telvari9@care2.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 7:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Candy LeBlanc

1525 Cold Springs Rd

SPC 52

Placerville, CA 95667

From: Liz Schwartz <lizbetschwartz@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 7:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Liz Schwartz

PO BOX 444

ARROYO SECO, NM 87514

From: Douglas Renick <renick.rinehart@comcast.net>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 7:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Douglas Renick

105 Black Birch Trail

Florence, MA 01062

From: A Adams <mailndp-gop@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 7:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

A Adams

20415 Via Pavisio

Cupertino, CA 95014

From: Cheriell Jensen <cherielj@earthlink.net>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 7:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Cheriell Jensen

13737 Quito

Saratoga, CA 95070 4752

From: Vonda Welty <vwelty@uoregon.edu>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 7:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Vonda Welty

PO Box 3266/4096 E 17th Ave

Eugene, OR 97403

From: Sylvia Gray <sylviaemail@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 7:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Gray

315 1st Avenue Apt 5

315 First Avenue #5

Salt Lake City, UT 84103

From: Ramona Harragin <rasta@frontiernet.net>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 7:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ramona Harragin

PO BOX 643

GOSHEN, NY 10924

From: Lindsay Crouch <lindsaycrouch12@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 7:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lindsay Crouch

Brattleboro, VT 05301

From: Terry Burns <tbscpbbsc@satx.rr.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 7:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Draft Nuclear Waste Administration Act of 2013'

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this draft legislation. I have studied the draft, and the accompanying comments.

I agree that nuclear waste storage remains a serious unsolved problem. Waste that will remain highly toxic for thousands of years is not easy to dispose of, despite decades of effort. As a result it is disingenuous to refer to nuclear power as "our greatest source of low-cost, clean, reliable electricity," as Senator Alexander does on the Committee website. Electricity production that leaves tons and tons of near eternally toxic waste is not "clean". It is also not "low-cost", as the complete inability of finding Wall Street support without Price-Anderson demonstrates. Only the taxpayers make nuclear power viable in any way, taking all the risk, financial and safety, and ultimately burdened with this horrible waste. The only real solution is to stop producing this waste as soon as possible.

In the interim, surely improvements can be made. I support many of the administrative proposals in the draft. It is possible that a new independent agency, and Oversight Board, would provide better regulatory oversight of nuclear waste, especially from nuclear power plants.

I strongly oppose, however, the concept of moving waste around the country, until there is an acceptable, permanent disposal repository for this waste. Moving the waste in the "interim" will not speed up the process of repository siting and development. Instead, it will only act as a favor to the nuclear power industry, removing the waste from current plant locations, to new "interim storage" locations, at taxpayer expense and removing all liability from industry to taxpayer.

In addition, the development of "interim storage" sites will not in any way make current nuclear plant facilities safer. Those sites will remain highly contaminated and dangerous in the plants themselves. And spent fuel rods will still need to be kept in water cooling pools for several years prior to transfer to dry storage.

I strongly urge the Senators to reorient their proposals to improve regulatory oversight and safety at the nuclear power facilities themselves.

These facilities are, of course, regulated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The NRC has a long history of excessive closeness with the nuclear power industry, frequently overlooking serious safety and security failures etc. While the NRC may continue to oversee the power plants, I believe the proposal for a separate "Nuclear Waste Administration" could greatly improve the oversight of nuclear waste at these power plants. Spent fuel pools are becoming overcrowded with fuel rods, risking a Fukushima like meltdown. The pools are largely unprotected from possible aerial attack or other disaster.

Nuclear power plant spent fuel is then transferred to dry storage canisters. I oppose the concept of trucks and trains traveling throughout the country carrying these massive Hiroshima plus hazardous objects, only for "interim storage". If it has to be done, let it only be done ONCE and never more.

Until that time when there is a permanent repository for disposal of this devil's filth, it should remain at its sites of creation, in above ground, closely monitored, hardened on site storage facilities fully protected from terrorist and natural disaster.

The proposed NWA could greatly improve regulation and oversight of nuclear waste at nuclear power plants. The Senators should address nuclear waste safety as their first priority, not the financial health of the nuclear power industry. It is true taxpayers continue to bear the cost of failure to develop a permanent repository. Developing more nuclear power will never help the taxpayers, only the profits of the industry. It is manifestly not true today that nuclear power is cheap, necessary, or safe. Truly renewable energy is developing rapidly and will successfully replace this really dirty source of energy, allowing us to finally put the genie back in the bottle for our children's future health and safety.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over, emphasizing safety first.

Sincerely,

Terry Burns, M.D.

Terry Burns

13139 Vista del Mundo

San Antonio, TX 78216

From: Dale Noonkester <daleneedsthis@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 6:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dale Noonkester

P.O. Box 91

Potrero, CA 91963

From: Pat Cuvillo <pcuvie@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 6:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Pat Cuvillo

Box 2834

Redwood City, CA 94064

From: Pat Cuvillo <pcuvie@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 6:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Pat Cuvillo

Box 2834

Redwood City, CA 94064

From: Steve Kohn <steve@teleology.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 6:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Steve Kohn

200 Sterling Place

Highland, NY 12528

From: erin yarrobino <bggr34@aol.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 6:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

erin yarrobino

84-23 109 AVE

84-23 109 ave

OZONE PARK, NY 11417

From: Nina Mojica <nrkasla@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 6:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nina Mojica

Nina Mojica

136 East 36th Street

10 a

New York, NY 10016

From: Michelle Friessen <mfriessen@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 5:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michelle Friessen

5125 La Fiesta Dr NE

Albuquerque, NM 87109

From: Katherine Miller <dgmandkm@san.rr.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 5:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply UNACCEPTABLE.

No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Katherine Miller

3911 Mount Aladin Avenue

San Diego, CA 92111

From: MeiLi McCann-Sayles <alanjunk@suddenlink.net>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 5:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

MeiLi McCann-Sayles

1696 Ocean Drive

McKinleyville, CA 95519

From: Sarah Scher, MD <sarahpol@humboldt1.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 5:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sarah Scher, MD

770 Tenth Street

Arcata, CA 95521

From: Alan McCann-Sayles <alanpol@humboldt1.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 5:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Alan McCann-Sayles

1696 Ocean Drive

McKinleyville, CA 95519

From: Daniel McCann-Sayles <danielms@humboldt1.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 5:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Daniel McCann-Sayles

1696 Ocean Drive

McKinleyville, CA 95519

From: Perianne Walter <perianne.walter@verizon.net>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 5:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Perianne Walter

8 Hilltop Road

Mendham, NJ 07945

From: Kelley Scanlon <rynn30@aol.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 4:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kelley Scanlon

281 Norwood Avenue

Syracuse, NY 13206

From: Quentin Fischer <fischerq@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 4:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Quentin Fischer

2514 Sharmar Rd.

Roanoke, VA 24018

From: Vivienne Mann <jpurpleviv@aol.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 4:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Vivienne Mann

759 Mt. Calvary Rd

Ridge Spring, SC 29129

From: mary williams <bishwake@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 4:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mary Williams

1450 S. W. Temple

1992 S. 200 E., #424B

Salt Lake, UT 84115

From: Coy Lay <SolarCoy@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 4:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Coy Lay

13635 SW 115th Ave

Tigard, OR 97223

From: Rev. Jim Roberts <jarob401@aol.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 3:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rev. Jim Roberts

401 Paris Av.

Rockford, IL 61107

From: Patricia Baley <patricia.mcrae@unlv.edu>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 2:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patricia Baley

4150 E. Pinecrest Circle

Las Vegas, NV 89121

From: Jennifer Lake <jenlakec21@hotmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 2:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Lake

Taylorsville, UT 84123

From: Emily Lewis <emilygeorgialewis@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 2:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Emily Lewis

20 Treehouse Circle

Easthampton, MA 01027

From: andrew hanscom <prometheus@ecomail.org>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 2:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

andrew hanscom

w.1 st

nederland, CO 80466

From: lynne taylor <lynnestuff@laurelwoodart.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 2:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

lynne taylor

Gaston, OR 97119

From: nahanni southern <illumination.middleway@yahoo.ca>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 2:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

nahanni southern

206 Burnside w

victoria, BC V9A 3C1

From: Patrick Bacon <baconia@centurylink.net>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 2:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patrick Bacon

174 Dolly Road

Madison, NC 27025

From: Judy Bettencourt <jcacourt@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 2:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Nuclear Waste in the NW

I live in Salem, OR. My spouse fishes in the NW rivers and streams. Nuclear waste from Hanford is a concern. The tanks are falling apart and nuclear waste is leaking.

Honestly, you need to approve more funding for expert advise on how to remove and contain the problem waste. This has been ongoing for years. What's the matter with you people that you cannot plan a program and implement it? Get off your rear ends,ask for more advice, make a decision and MOVE ON IT!

From: David Hill <davidcitizen@msn.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 1:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Hill

612 SE Linn St

Portland, OR 97202

From: Lavina Bowman <abdarm@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 1:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lavina Bowman

701 Antelope Drive #10

Rock Springs, WY 82901

From: Liz Murphy <lizasmurphy@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 1:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Liz Murphy

47 Crescent Place

Monroe, CT 06468

From: Monica Salazar <crazynarutolover_1010@hotmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 1:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Monica Salazar

Cond. River Park Apt. O-206

Bayamon, PR 00961

From: NANCY MORRIS <ncm@w-link.net>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 1:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

NANCY MORRIS

PO BOX 60096

SEATTLE, WA 98160

From: NANCY MORRIS <ncm@w-link.net>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 1:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

NANCY MORRIS

PO BOX 60096

SEATTLE, WA 98160

From: Marie-Louise Jackson-Miller <marieljm1961@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 1:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marie-Louise Jackson-Miller

63 Gay Street

Quincy, MA 02169

From: Dean Windh <karaokeking1@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 1:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dean Windh

7506 95th Avenue SW

Lakewood, WA 98498

From: Jane Feldman <feldman.jane@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 12:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is on the wrong track

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem.

Two issues keep me awake at night - global warming and radwaste.

We need your help!

The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems. Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all.

No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly.

While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation.

A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways-- even without an accident.

Dozens of independent environmental groups have endorsed hardened, on-site storage (HOSS) principles as the course of action that minimizes risk to both people and the environment. The environmental groups are free of influence from wealth-making corporations and from enabling government regulators.

Please put public health and safety first and scrap your "discussion draft."

Sincerely,

Jane Feldman

5901 Martita Ave

5901 Martita Ave

Las Vegas, NV 89108

From: Brie Gyncild <brie@wordyfolks.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 12:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Nuclear waste bill feedback

Attachments: Question1_Brie_Gyncild_Washington_resident.doc

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the bill. I have attached my answer and comments on question 1 in your template. I don't feel I have the expertise or experience to answer the the other questions; I leave those to people who are more deeply involved in the issues. But I feel strongly about question 1, and I appreciate your taking the time to request and read feedback.

Brie Gyncild

1407 15th Ave

Seattle, WA 98122 From: Jan Tache <tache@together.net>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 12:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jan Tache

PO Box 1210

Penn Valley, CA 95946

From: johanna robohm <johanna@livewirefarm.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 12:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

johanna j. robohm

johanna robohm

467 butler brook road

po box 526

jacksonville, VT 05342

From: Lois Zinavage <wzinavage@aol.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 12:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lois Zinavage

51 Hanover-Versailles Rd.

None

Baltic, CT 06330

From: sharleene sherwin <sharlsher@aol.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 12:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

sharleene sherwin

6024 kantor st apt.4

apt.4

sandiego, CA 92122

From: Jennifer Scott <jjscott9@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 11:57 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Scott

15930 Bayside Pointe West #703

15930 Bayside Pointe West #703

Fort Myers, FL 33908

From: Christopher Lish <lishchris@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 11:37 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Christopher Lish

PO Box 113

Olema, CA 94950

From: Leslie Perrigo <wntrlark@hotmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 11:37 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Leslie Perrigo

808 W Main St.

2

Muncie, IN 47305

From: cecile claude <ceeceecalling@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 11:29 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

cecile claude

916 bluebird canyon dr.

laguna beach, CA 92651

From: Paul Graves <pgraves@nycap.rr.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 11:14 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Paul Graves

15 Providence Street

Albany, NY 12203

From: Leah Anne Brown <leahabrown@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 11:10 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Finally, when moving the waste does become necessary, public safety will require a massive publicity campaign ahead of the move, and shutting down highways and all other routes during transport. Obviously, this will be expensive and politically unpopular. Any responsible legislation today must

mandate the publicity and safety measures, and address the funding of them, by increasing taxes on the nuclear industry now.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Leah Anne Brown

Washington, DC 20009

From: Linda DeStefano <ldestefano3@twcnny.rr.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 11:00 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Linda DeStefano

5031 Onondaga Rd.

5031 Onondaga Rd., Syracuse

Syracuse, NY 13215

From: David Carr <dpcmadcty@hotmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 10:49 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Carr

606 S. Dickinson St.

Madison, WI 53703

From: Theresa Waldron <b.jaybird@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 10:36 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Theresa Waldron

po boc 438

PO Box 438

Lecanto, FL 34460

From: Shirley Middleton <smiddle@me.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 10:15 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Shirley Middleton

53 Ridge Rd.

Greenbelt, MD 20770

From: Dominick Falzone <dominick3@roadrunner.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 10:14 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dominick Falzone

745 S. Normandie Ave. Apt. 108

Los Angeles, CA 90005

From: Amelia Ramsey-Lefevre <amelia@peaceactioncny.org>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 10:11 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Amelia Ramsey-Lefevre

Syracuse, NY 13210

From: vicki musetti <msttvkk@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 10:09 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

vicki musetti

lopaus pt rd

bernard, ME 04612

From: Joe Luca <lucalieberow@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 9:58 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joe Luca

Brookline, MA 02446

From: yvonne eckstein <yme@pro-ns.net>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 9:44 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

yvonne eckstein

1912 dupont ave so, #407

1912 dupont ave so

minneapolis, MN 55403

From: Wanda Huelsman <paigeturner45066@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 9:43 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Wanda Huelsman

404 Lincoln Green Dr..

Lincoln Green Dr.

Dayton, OH 45449

From: Karen Miller <krisepoo@hotmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 9:18 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Karen Miller

129 Martha Dr

Corpus Christi, TX 78418

From: Mollie Schierman <mollie.schierman@co.anoka.mn.us>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 9:18 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mollie Schierman

4146 Zenith Avenue North

Robbinsdale, MN 55422

From: Linda Burton <linburton42@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 9:04 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Linda Burton

1408 spring st

radford, VA 24141

From: Bozena Grossman <bozenag51@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 9:01 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bozena Grossman

211East 7th Street

Brooklyn, NY 11218

From: Kathleen Morris <kmorris@ohnurses.org>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 9:00 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Morris

181 E. Beechwold Blvd.

Columbus, OH 43214

From: Keith Fabing <keithfabing@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 8:45 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Keith Fabing

4816 S. Alaska Street

Seattle, WA 98118

From: Erma Lewis <elewisny@hotmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 8:44 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Erma Lewis

1736 63 Street

1736 63 Street

Brooklyn, NY 11204

From: Sylvia Richey <srichey7@hotmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 8:27 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Richey

7410 Lake Breeze Dr.

Fort Myers, FL 33907

From: Carolyn Friedman <chiroangel@aol.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 8:20 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Friedman

P.O. Box 17

P.O. Box 17

Willow, NY 12495

From: Gary Williamson <Gmson@att.net>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 8:16 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gary Williamson

5 Sixteenth Green Ct

Belleville, IL 62220

From: Elizabeth Williams <wethbilliams@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 8:15 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Williams

4469 Sedgwick St., N.W.

Washington, DC 20016

From: Jessica Thompson <jesshu@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 7:51 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jessica Thompson

PO Box 79

New Harmony, IN 47631

From: Hattie nestel <Hattieshalom@verizon.net>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 7:47 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Hattie nestel

athol, MA 01331

From: alice slater <aslater@rcn.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 7:36 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

alice slater

446 e 86 st

ny

NY, NY 10028

From: Darrel Easter <deaster@netzero.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 7:06 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Darrel Easter

3165 Woodsman LN

Bartlett, TN 38135

From: Michelle Six <dragonfle122@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 6:46 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michelle Six

400 Taylor Dr apt 402

Port Byron, IL 61275

From: D P <pdesai@care2.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 6:37 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

D P

3

F, FL 33301

From: Ronald Hurston <Rhur@msn.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 6:04 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ronald Hurston

29 shaw drive

Wayland, MA 01778

From: Margaret Runfors <murun53@hotmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 5:59 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Margaret Runfors

Tunnlandsgatan 24b

Örebro, ot +46

From: Ludger Wilp <enoeno@web.de>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 5:31 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ludger Wilp

Poettering 21

Poettering 21

Bottrop, ot 46244

From: MargaretAnn Bowers <pocomotion8@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 5:14 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Toxic industry with NO PROPER Elimination Process blew a gasket...all over big-money, false-energy addicts.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

MargaretAnn Bowers

433 N Geneva St

Ithaca, NY 14850

From: D P <pdesai@care2.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 4:05 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

D P

3

F, FL 33301

From: John Herbert <jharlanherb@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 3:43 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Ron Wyden, you need to represent us in Oregon and protect all Americans' safety by not moving this stuff more than once.

Sincerely,

John Herbert

11935 SW Edgewood

Portland, OR 97225

From: Deena Brazy <dbrindl@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 2:58 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Deena Brazy

5305 Loruth Ter

Madison, WI 53711

From: Frances Frainaguirre <jaguirreja@aol.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 2:02 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Frances Frainaguirre

1840 W 40th

Denver, CO 80211

From: LuMarion Conklin <conklinlu@npgcable.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 1:21 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

LuMarion Conklin

3114 Loma Vista Dr.

3114 Loma Vista Dr.

Flagstaff, AZ, AZ 86004

From: LynMarie Berntson <rlbernt@earthlink.net>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 12:52 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

LynMarie Berntson

6697 Boyd Ave

6697 Boyd Ave

Eden Prairie, MN 55346

From: Lauren Graham <laurendonna@hotmail.co>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 12:31 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lauren Graham

PO Box 420121

San Francisco, CA 94142

From: Krishna Jade Cantwell <way_out_is_in@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 12:24 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Krishna Jade Cantwell

Orlando, FL 32804

From: Teresa Anderson <teresa5916@aol.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 12:15 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Teresa Anderson

11677 Marietta Ave

Clovis, CA 93619

From: Margaret Copi <tango.lindygirl@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 12:05 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Margaret Copi

3426 Adell Ct

Oakland, CA 94602

From: Susan Fleming <susanlfleming@hotmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 12:00 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Susan Fleming

1856 Maple Glen Drive

Plainfield, IL 60586

From: Lisa Cohen <Lisa@thecohenfamily.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 11:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lisa Cohen

179 OLD POST RD N

179 Old Post Road North

CROTON ON HUDSON, NY 10520

From: David Starr <David@BerkshireNatural.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 11:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Starr

102 Bancroft Rd.

Northampton, MA 01060

From: Karen Orchard <Orchard543@aol.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 11:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Karen Orchard

722 Upper Third St

Kellogg, ID 83837

From: Colleen Lobel <clobel1@san.rr.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 11:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Colleen Lobel

8111 Kenova St

San Diego

CA 92126, CA 92126

From: Mona Kool-Harrington <koolharrington@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 11:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mona Kool-Harrington

424 Elm Street

Phoenix, OR 97535

From: Martha Milne <milnemw@netzero.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 11:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Martha Milne

1764 Braman Av.

Fort Myers, FL 33901

From: Jack Hinds <hstuffope@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 11:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jack Hinds

12 Dogwood Meadows Ln

Stuart, VA 24171

From: Rebecca Hoeschler <rshoeschler@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 10:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Hoeschler

328 E. Imperial Ave., No. 5

El Segundo, CA 90245

From: Kashka Kubzdela <kubz@aya.yale.edu>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 10:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kashka Kubzdela

2721 Clarkes Landing Dr.

Oakton

VA 22124, VA 22124

From: Jacqueline Ayala <jacquelinef.ayala@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 10:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Ayala

917 NE 42nd PL

Homestead, FL 33033

From: Gaia Mika <gaia.mika@colorado.edu>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 10:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gaia Mika

425 Valverde Commons Dr

Taos, NM 87571

From: Tom Wenzel <tomwenzel@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 10:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Tom Wenzel

2063 Meadowbrook rd.

Prescott, AZ 86303

From: Lisa Witham <lisa4809@att.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 10:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lisa Witham

5980 Marine Pkwy D117

Mentor on the Lake, OH 44060

From: Martin Landa <marty@faceuptopeace.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 10:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Martin Landa

Siesta Lane

2137 Savannah River Street

Sedona, AZ 86351

From: Linda Fair <lindafair@taosnet.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 10:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Linda Fair

PO Box 156

El Prado, NM 87529

From: Sylvan Grey <lenrivers@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 9:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sylvan Grey

4826 SE 76th Ave

Portland, OR 97206

From: Joy Hoover <j.melba.hoover@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 9:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joy Hoover

3395 Via Barba

3395 Via Barba

Lompoc, CA 93436

From: marcia bailey <marciabcelo@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 9:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

marcia bailey

1270 Cabbage Patch Rd

Burnsville, NC 28714

From: Julien Kaven Parcou <jkparcou@seychelles.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 9:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Julien Kaven Parcou

P.O. Box 559, Victoria House

P.O. Box 559, Victoria House

Victoria, ot 00248

From: Amy Agigian <agigian@mac.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 9:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Amy Agigian

33 Corinthian Road

33 Corinthian Road

Somerville, MA 02144

From: BB Nibbom <bbnibbom@aol.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 9:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

BB Nibbom

Del Mar, CA 92014

From: Lizabeth Rogers <Ladylz428@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 8:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lizabeth Rogers

650-102 Brocton Ct

Long Beach, CA 90803

From: Rosalind Newton <zenmasteress@aol.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 8:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rosalind Newton

1697 Warwick Avenue

21697 Warwick Ave

Warwick, RI 02889

From: Anne Craig <ennagiarc@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 8:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Anne Craig

132 Murdock Ave.

132 Murdock Ave.

Asheville, NC 28801

From: jamie clemons <ghostlly@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 8:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

We should have learned from Fukushima that nuclear waste storage is dangerous. Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

jamie clemons

8 south randall road

8 south randall road

AURORA, IL 60506

From: paul gallimore <paul@longbrancheec.org>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 8:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

paul gallimore

278 Boyd Cove Rd.

POB 369

leicester, NC 28748

From: Kassy Killey <kassyc@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 8:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kassy Killey

1703 W Queens Court Road

Peoria, IL 61614

From: Randi Perkins <randi.perkins@charter.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 8:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Randi Perkins

10009 Old Morro Rd East

Atascadero, CA 93422

From: richard rushforth <vanmonk@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 8:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

richard rushforth

14 cuesta road

santa fe, NM 87508

From: Jessica Fondy <j_fondy@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 8:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jessica Fondy

1835 Arlington Ave

Pittsburgh, PA 15210

From: Joy Martin <joyjoytotheworld@cs.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 8:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joy Martin

4143 Federer

4143 Federer

St Louis, MO 63116

From: Judy Taylor <parrisjt@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 8:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Judy Taylor

135 Coles Neck Rd.

Wellfleet, MA 02667

From: Lenore Baum <lenoreandjoe@charter.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 8:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lenore Baum

164 Ox Creek Road

Weaverville, NC 28787

From: Robin Bee <rentalsat robinbee@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 8:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Your radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Robin Bee

1430 Willamette street

Eugene, OR 97401

From: Terry Ermini <savitriermini@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 8:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Terry Ermini

2330 Hurley Way

2443 Fair Oaks Blvd., #206

Sacramento, CA 95825

From: Martha E. Martin <mauimarttha@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 7:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It is of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is a failure, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would both increase the risks of accidents and security problems and also guarantee increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Creating another interim storage site blocks progress on choosing a permanent nuclear waste site. . No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would result in that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry (which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program). The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Martha E. Martin

P.O.Box 790300

PO Box 790300, Paia, HI 96779

Paia, HI 96779

From: Martha Izzo <marthalovesoso@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 7:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Martha Izzo

Kinney Creek

Evergreen, CO 80439

From: Cynthia Fisk <cynthfi@verizon.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 7:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Fisk

27 Chapel St.

Gloucester, MA 01930

From: Julie English <speaking4animals2@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 7:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Julie English

4234 Elkorn Blvd

Sacramento, CA 95835

From: jeff hopkins <jhop-90@earthlink.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 7:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

jeff hopkins

69 amber court

Lindenhurst, IL 60046

From: maxine priest <agehapriest@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 7:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

maxine priest

2618 mlk blvd

new orleans, LA 70113

From: Kerry Cooke <kvcooke@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 7:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kerry Cooke

4002 Albion St

83705

Boise, ID 83705

From: Walt Kleine <Wkleine@netwiz.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 7:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Walt Kleine

3267 Hollis

Oakland, CA 94608

From: Claudine Cremer <cpremer@frontier.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 7:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Claudine Cremer

260 Dula Springs Road

Weaverville, NC 28787

From: L. Watchempino <5000wave@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 7:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

L. Watchempino

P.O. Box 407

Pueblo of Acoma, NM 87034

From: Susan Clark <susan.g.clark@embarqmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 7:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Susan Clark

168 W. Valley Brook Rd.

Califon, NJ 07830

From: James Amory <cheeseresource@me.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 7:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

James Amory

RR 2, Box 71-A1

63 Cheddar Lane

Leraysville, PA 18829

From: Tara Verbridge <taraverbridge@yahoo.ca>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 7:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Tara Verbridge

1345 Wescot

Windsor, MI 48004

From: Casey Wittmier <catguy41@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Casey Wittmier

N/A, OR 97394

From: gerry collins <coronadofirst@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

gerry collins

25222 madron

Murrieta, CA 92563

From: Lynn Elliott <craper@nc.rr.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lynn Elliott

2614 Woodmont Dr

Durham, NC 27705

From: tara hands <tarahands@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

tara hands

2002 Countryside Place SE

Smyrna, GA 30080

From: Connie Raper <ckraper@nc.rr.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Connie Raper

2614 Woodmont Dr

Durham, NC 27705

From: lydia garvey <wolfhowlmama@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

lydia garvey

429 s 24th st

Clinton, OK 73601

From: mark & susan glasser <mark7glasser@ca.rr.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

mark & susan glasser

3660 barry ave

LA, CA 90088

From: mark & susan glasser <mark7glasser@ca.rr.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

mark & susan glasser

3660 barry ave

LA, CA 90088

From: Karin Zambrano <rockera1978@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Karin Zambrano

262 Taaffe place

Brooklyn, NY 11205

From: Charles Woodliff <ps_122841791@care2.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Charles Woodliff

119 Boxwood Avenue

Cornelia, GA 30531

From: Jane Davidson <romjulcat@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jane Davidson

435 Valley View Road

Englewood, NJ 07631

From: richard rushforth <vanmonk@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

richard rushforth

14 cuesta road

santa fe, NM 87508

From: Felice Nord <F_Nord@msn.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Felice Nord

11 Mountain View Dr

Weaverville, NC 28787

From: Edith Kantrowitz <reweaving@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Edith Kantrowitz

333 McDonald Avenue - #5D

Brooklyn, NY 11218

From: Jeanne Gallo, Ph.D. <gritarenow@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Gallo, Ph.D.

Gloucester, MA 01930

From: jeff hopkins <jhop-90@earthlink.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

jeff hopkins

69 amber court

Lindenhurst, IL 60046

From: jeff hopkins <jhop-90@earthlink.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

jeff hopkins

69 amber court

Lindenhurst, IL 60046

From: jeff hopkins <jhop-90@earthlink.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

jeff hopkins

69 amber court

Lindenhurst, IL 60046

From: philip bates <tampabates@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

philip bates

seffner, FL 33584

From: Judy Krach <JHawk3989@aol.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Judy Krach

3517 Bordeaux Court

hazel crest, IL 60429

From: Judy Krach <JHawk3989@aol.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Judy Krach

3517 Bordeaux Court

hazel crest, IL 60429

From: Robert Orlando <robhood00@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Robert Orlando

4705 State Highway 28

4705 State Highway 28

Cooperstown, NY 13326

From: Janet Draper <jntdraper@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Janet Draper

1825 Dunedin Ave.

Duluth, MN 55803

From: jeff hopkins <jhop-90@earthlink.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

jeff hopkins

69 amber court

Lindenhurst, IL 60046

From: jeff hopkins <jhop-90@earthlink.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 5:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

jeff hopkins

69 amber court

Lindenhurst, IL 60046

From: Kirk Miller <kirkmiller3@juno.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 5:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kirk Miller

517 Cap Rock Drive

Richardson, TX 75080

From: Patricia Schoenberger <spacedgirlhero@msn.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 5:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patricia Schoenberger

13670 Valley View Road #114

Eden Prairie, MN 55344

From: Bruce Barry <bkbarry@suffolk.lib.ny.us>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 5:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bruce Barry

20 Black Locust Ave

East Setauket, NY 11733

From: Whitney Metz <whitneythedryad@vegmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 5:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Whitney Metz

100 1/2 East Main Street

Mannington, WV 26582

From: Debra Tate <dttomatoes@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 5:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Debra Tate

PO Box 788

Gibsonton, FL 33534

From: Dale Noonkester <daleneedsthis@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 5:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dale Noonkester

P.O. Box 91

Potrero, CA 91963

From: Dale Noonkester <daleneedsthis@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 5:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dale Noonkester

P.O. Box 91

Potrero, CA 91963

From: Dale Noonkester <daleneedsthis@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 5:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dale Noonkester

P.O. Box 91

Potrero, CA 91963

From: jeff hopkins <jhop-90@earthlink.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 5:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

jeff hopkins

69 amber court

Lindenhurst, IL 60046

From: martha leahy <martha638@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 5:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

martha leahy

39 lockeland rd

39 lockeland rd

winchester, MA 01890

From: Karen Peralta <karenperalta51@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 5:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Karen Peralta

PO Box 82876

#8

Kenmore, WA 98028

From: jeff hopkins <jhop-90@earthlink.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 5:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

jeff hopkins

69 amber court

Lindenhurst, IL 60046

From: karen stickney <kstick35@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 4:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

karen stickney

27 baril street

lewiston, ME 04240

From: Vic Macks <vicmacks3@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 4:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Vic Macks

20318 Edmunton

20318 Edmunton

St. Clair Shores, MI 48080

From: D. Singer <singerde@ymail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 4:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

D. Singer

Oakland, CA 94607

From: Catherine George <cathygeorge@earthlink.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 4:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Catherine George

1836 Locust Street

Address Line 2

Napa, CA 94559

From: jeff hopkins <jhop-90@earthlink.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 4:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

jeff hopkins

69 amber court

Lindenhurst, IL 60046

From: Alexa Garcia <alexagenon@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 4:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Alexa Garcia

4002 SE 28TH PL

Portland, OR 97202

From: Donna Shroyer <d_shroyer@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 4:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Donna Shroyer

Meeker, CO 81641

From: Thomas Paulson <tomwp577@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 4:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Thomas Paulson

719 Normandie Drive

not applicable

Norman, OK 73072

From: Erik Hoffner <ehoffner@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 4:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Erik Hoffner

795 Ashfield Mtn Rd

795 Ashfield Mtn Rd

Ashfield, MA 01330

From: HANNAH FREED <girlinterrupted@mail2world.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 4:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

HANNAH FREED

145 S. Holliston, Apt E

Pasadena, CA 91106

From: Judy Nakadegawa <jnakadegawa@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 3:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Judy Nakadegawa

751 The Alameda

Berkeley, CA 94707

From: Dean Silver <dean@silvagio.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 3:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dean Silver

1035 Timberline Ter

Ashland, OR 97520

From: Derek Stockdale <delstockdale@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 3:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Derek Stockdale

13 Deanfield

Bangor, CA 90210

From: Janet Maker <jamaker2001@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 3:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Janet Maker

925 Malcolm Ave

925 malcolm av

Los Angeles, CA 90024

From: Stuart McDonald <sam3915@q.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 3:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Stuart McDonald

448 Segoe Ave

Salt Lake City, UT 84111

From: Rheta Johnson <rheta.johnson@me.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 3:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rheta Johnson

8033 Cobble Creek Circle

Potomac, MD 20854

From: Lynn Walker <mooncrone@mac.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 3:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lynn Walker

15901 Corsica Ave

Cleveland, OH 44110

From: Helena Wu <Helena@goodmedicinetree.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 3:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Helena Wu

121 Chaves Rd.

Londonderry, VT 05148

From: Linda Brebner <lbbreb@aol.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 3:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Linda Brebner

254 Highland Parkway

Rochester, NY 14620

From: karol benner <karolbenner@cox.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 3:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

karol benner

108 del cabo

san clemente, CA 92673

From: Lorraine Caputo <lcaputoc@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 2:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Caputo

POB 268

POB 268

Columbia, MO 65205

From: eileen schmitz <eileenmschmitz@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 2:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

eileen schmitz

1429 monterey dr.

monterey drive

santa fe, NM 87505

From: Louisa Cohen <louisacvegas@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 2:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Louisa Cohen

700 Carnegie St #1113

Henderson, NV 89052

From: Vicky Hicks <hicks@bluemarble.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 2:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Vicky Hicks

6610 Knob Creek road

Heltonville, IN 47436

From: Thomas Driscoll <thomasdriscoll4@msn.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 2:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Thomas Driscoll

9 Spinney Way

Huyton

Liverpool, ot L36 4PG

From: Michelle Krysztopik <michelleKry@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 2:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michelle Krysztopik

11811 Blythewood

San Antonio, TX 78249

From: Daviana Rowe <davianarowe@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 2:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Daviana Rowe

22 Coral Place

Greenwood Vlg., CO 80111

From: Liz Schwartz <lizbetschwartz@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 1:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Liz Schwartz

PO BOX 444

ARROYO SECO, NM 87514

From: Richard Kollmar <rtkollmar@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 1:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Richard Kollmar

1101 Iris Ln

Address Line 2

Santa Cruz, CA 95062

From: JoAn Saltzen <jsaltzen@cal.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 1:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

JoAn Saltzen

3223 Morro Bay Avenue

Davis, CA 95616

From: Barbara Mckay <barbara-mckay@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 1:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Barbara Mckay

1710 Greenbush Rd.

N Ferrisburgh, VT 05473

From: adene katzenmeyer <adene@cot.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 12:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

adene katzenmeyer

5016 solus

weed, CA 96094

From: gene burke <burkegene@msn.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 12:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over!?

Thank you if you can do that please.

Sincerely,

gene burke

woodland hills, CA 91365

From: Lisa Wolf <chocolatenibs@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 12:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lisa Wolf

Framingham, MA 01701

From: bert marian <medicinebear@roadrunner.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 12:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

bert marian

168 water st

none

addison, ME 04606

From: Francine Ungaro <fbungaro@cox.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 12:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Francine Ungaro

639 Andrews Street

Southington, CT 06489

From: D. Leo-Thiha Ike <darcyike@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 12:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

D. Leo-Thiha Ike

4754 Idaho St

Saan Diego, CA 92116

From: Robert Hall <rh@solaritis.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 12:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Robert Hall

15531 42nd Rd N

Loxahatchee, FL 33470

From: Samantha Shattuck <smshattuck916@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 12:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Samantha Shattuck

auburn, CA 95603

From: Aubrey Wulfsohn <awu@maths.warwick.ac.uk>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 12:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Aubrey Wulfsohn

19 Warwick Place

19 Warwick Place

Leamington spa, ot CV32 5BS

From: Craig Rhodes <craighrhodes@djklink.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 12:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Craig Rhodes

3883 Mt. Pleasant Rd.

Brookport, IL 62910

From: Susan De Vos <mabaa@tds.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 11:58 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Susan De Vos

610 N. Midvale Blvd.

Madison, WI 53705

From: Kittredge Cherry <happynowxx@aol.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 11:53 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kittredge Cherry

1328 Montecito Circle

Los Angeles, CA 90031

From: Vera Cousins <vcousins1@iowatelecom.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 11:10 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Vera Cousiins

903 16th Ave.

903 16th Ave.

Grinnell, IA 50112

From: Anne Padilla <groesa@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 10:42 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Anne Padilla

2100 Calle de la Vuelta

Santa Fe, NM 87505

From: Barbara Oneal <barbaraoneal@embarqmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 9:25 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Barbara Oneal

173 Roy Duncan Lane

173 Roy Duncan Lane

Erwin, TN 37650

From: David Loiselle <dave.loiselle@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 9:24 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Loisel

402 North English Hill

Hillsborough, NC 27278

From: Lorenz Steininger <schreibdemstein@posteo.de>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 9:16 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lorenz Steininger

Waldstr

Hohenwart, VA 22554

From: Margaret Dunn <dunrovin20032003@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 9:12 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

This kind of nonsense was tried years ago with the white trains and white unlabeled trucks that transported nuclear waste throughout the country; it didn't work then because of all the activists that stopped them. So why are you trying it again???

Margaret Dunn

Margaret Dunn

W4009 12th Rd.

307 N. Rush St.

Montello, WI 53949

From: Jerry Mawhorter <head424@wowway.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 9:08 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jerry Mawhorter

200 Linden Avenue

Royal Oak, MI 48073

From: Seth Rutledge <thesniffingratty@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 8:41 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Seth Rutledge

611 S Beech St

Syracuse, NY 13210

From: marcia hart <marciahart@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 8:30 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

marcia hart

2 Fremont St.

Gloucester, MA 01930

From: Areil Larsen <greendaybeatle13@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 7:33 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Areil Larsen

382 Lemon Street

San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

From: Marialoreto Landi <marialoretolandi@libero.it>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 7:12 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marialoreto Landi

fisciano

salerno

Salerno, ot 84084

From: Nancy Neumann <NancyNeumann@t-online.de>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:34 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nancy Neumann

Graugasse 1

Zornheim, ot 55270

From: Ludger Wilp <enoeno@web.de>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:26 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ludger Wilp

Poettering 21

Poettering 21

Bottrop, ot 46244

From: Ludger Wilp <enoeno@web.de>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:26 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ludger Wilp

Poettering 21

Poettering 21

Bottrop, ot 46244

From: Flora Pino García <florapino@bme.es>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:12 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Flora Pino García

Alameda del Valle, Madrid, Españ, ot 28749

From: Bob Fay <RFay808700@aol.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 6:12 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bob Fay

4000 24th St.N.

Lot 1108

St. Petersburg, FL 33714

From: Christopher Panayi <immortal1958@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 5:28 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Christopher Panayi

4, Devon Lodge,

Carlton Hill,

Brighton,, ot BN2 0HF

From: Bill Evans <billev@efn.org>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 5:12 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Thank you for your Attention,

Sincerely,

Bill Evans

2925 Durbin St

Eugene, OR 97405

From: John and Martha Stoltenberg <jpstolten@frontier.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 3:55 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John and Martha Stoltenberg

N8362 State Highway 67

P.O. Box 596

Elkhart Lake, WI 53020

From: Virginia H. Bennett <vbennett@hawaii.edu>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 3:47 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Virginia H. Bennett

1201 Wilder Ave. #1704

#1704

Honolulu, HI 96822

From: Mrs.Sunil G.M. <sunilgmbm@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 3:01 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mrs.Sunil G.M.

Near St.Paul's Cathedral

New York, NY 10007

From: Liana Wong <sakura_bear71@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 3:00 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Liana Wong

1086 Vista Grande

Millbrae, CA 94030

From: Michelle Buerger <stargirl_46@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 2:10 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michelle Buerger

50 Schroeder Ct. #104

Madison, WI 53711

From: Carol Huntsman <chuntsman@san.rr.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 1:55 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carol Huntsman

2750 Wheatstone St.#30

2750 wheatstone St.#30

San Diego, CA 92111

From: Katharine Kagel <kkagel@cybermesa.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 1:47 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Katharine Kagel

121 Don Gaspar Street

121 Don Gaspar

Santa Fe, NM 87501

From: Susannah Mills <sooz@sonic.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 1:46 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Susannah Mills

Box # 402

Bolinas, CA 94924

From: Janet Neihart <janeihart66@aol.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 1:43 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Janet Neihart

6751 Geneva Ave. So.

Cottage Grove, MN 55016

From: Suzy R <sfr@nj.rr.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 1:38 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Suzy R

One Main St

New York, NY 10101

From: Marilyn Hoff <marigayl@netzero.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 1:31 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Hoff

PO Box 295, El Prado, NM

El Prado, NM 87529

From: Patty Hannigan <pattyhannigan@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 1:31 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

B

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Party Hannigan

19 nickell Rd

Ranchos de Taos, NM 87557

From: Margaret Kuchnia <aumuma@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 1:25 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Margaret Kuchnia

5228 E. Falls View Dr.

San Diego, CA 92115

From: Kristin Womack <kristinwomack@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 1:00 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kristin Womack

396 San Francisco Boulevard

San Anselmo, CA 94960

From: Garland Cole <garland.cole@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 1:00 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Garland Cole

457 W. 28th St.

1FL

chicago, IL 60616

From: Esther Zamora <ezjamoca@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 12:55 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Esther Zamora

12456 Los Moras Way

Victorville, CA 92392

From: Denise Lytle <centauress6@live.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 12:52 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Denise Lytle

73 Poplar St.

Fords, NJ 08863

From: Don McKelvey <donmckelvey38@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 12:02 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Don McKelvey

20950 Priday Ave

Euclid, OH 44123

From: Bryna Pizzo <brynapizzo@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 12:01 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bryna Pizzo

4414 Gemini Dr.

St. Louis, MO 63128

From: George Gallagher <george19054@aol.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

George Gallagher

28 Full Turn Rd

28 Full Turn Rd

Levittown, PA 19056

From: Stephen Schenck <stephens@xemaps.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Stephen Schenck

PO Box 397

Simi Valley, CA 93062

From: Ralph Alvarez <rja19@att.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ralph Alvarez

6 Scenic Pond Drive

6 Scenic Pond Drive

Warwick, NY 10990

From: Carol Elliott <carolrelliott@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carol Elliott

1648 32nd st

San Diego, CA 92102

From: Bryn Hammarstrom <bryn@epix.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

As an RN, and parent of two daughters, I thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bryn Hammarstrom

R.D.#2

Middlebury Ctr, PA 16935

From: Janet Neihart <janeihart66@aol.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Janet Neihart

6751 Geneva Ave. So.

Cottage Grove, MN 55016

From: dale saltzman <dalesaltzman1@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

dale saltzman

yorktown, NY 10598

From: Kenneth Mills <millskenneth@comcast.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Mills

1

Seattle, WA 98125

From: Linda Jarsky <sserenity12@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Martin Luther King Jr. is quoted as saying, "Never, never be afraid to do what's right, especially if the well-being of a person or animal is at stake. Society's punishments are small compared to the wounds we inflict on our soul when we look the other way."

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Martin Luther King Jr. is quoted as saying, "Never, never be afraid to do what's right, especially if the well-being of a person or animal is at stake. Society's punishments are small compared to the wounds we inflict on our soul when we look the other way."

Sincerely,

Linda Jarsky

705 Pine Street

705 Pine Street

Port Huron, MI 48060

From: Crystal Conklin <eidhlyn@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Crystal Conklin

5902 W Royal Palm

#82

Glendale, AZ 85302

From: anita simons <asimonsays@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

anita simons

2217 caminito preciosa sur

la jolla, CA 92037

From: karen ambrose <karennandini@yahoo.co.in>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

karen ambrose

217 arbolado drive

217 arbolado drive

la selva beach, CA 95076

From: Unplug Salem <rmlerario@msn.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Unplug Salem

2 Woodhurst Court

Eastampton, NJ 08060

From: Rosemarie Sawdon <sawdon@msn.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rosemarie Sawdon

1201 Harvest Ridge Lane

Blacksburg, VA 24060

From: Thomas Ambrogi <tambrogi@verizon.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Thomas Ambrogi

737 Alden Road

737 Alden Road

Claremont, CA, CA 91711

From: Rachel Garibay-Wynnberry <rachelgaribay@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rachel Garibay-Wynnberry

33

3342 Yonge Ave.

Sarasota, FL 34235

From: Lee Bailey <ladibg@earthlink.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lee Bailey

700 Warren Av

ithaca, NY 14850

From: Russ Berger <rgberger@cableone.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Russ Berger

5639 E. Gateway Dr.

Boise, ID 83716

From: Dian Berger <dianberger@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dian Berger

5639 E. Gateway Dr.

Boise, ID 83716

From: Marie Steckler <mariesteckler@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marie Steckler

515 Nerinx Road

515 Nerinx Road

Nerinx, KY 40049

From: Sara Williams <wickedbeatles@aol.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sara Williams

9634 Oak Glen Road

Cherry Valley, CA 92223

From: Doris Lehr <dorislehr@earthlink.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Doris Lehr

58-13 213 St

Bayside Hills, NY 11364 1827

From: ute trowell <utesdogs2@yahoo.co.uk>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

ute trowell

kalymnos, ot 85200

From: Tom Wenzel <tomwenzel@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Tom Wenzel

2063 Meadowbrook rd.

Prescott, AZ 86303

From: Anthony Iacono <dkong1190@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Anthony Iacono

1024 Avenue W

Brooklyn, NY 11223

From: Julien Kaven Parcou <jkparcou@seychelles.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Julien Kaven Parcou

P.O. Box 559, Victoria House

P.O. Box 559, Victoria House

Victoria, ot 00248

From: Bruce Giudici <bgiudici@caltel.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bruce Giudici

8572 Goggin St

Valley Spgs, CA 95252

From: Beth Sutton <bas@enkieducation.org>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Beth Sutton

97 Verndale Ave

Providence, RI 02905

From: Todd Fry <tafry@neo.rr.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Todd Fry

505 Sloane Ave.

Mansfield, OH 44903

From: Catherine Ziurella <volartez@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 8:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

NUCLEAR ENERGY IS UNSAFE AND EXPENSIVE OVER LONG-TERM. THE OCONEE PLANT IN SC IS CLOSE TO A Fukushima DISASTER IF THE DAM BREAKS OR OVERFLOWS. CITIZENS FROM HUNDREDS OF MILES AWAY SHOULD SIT ON THE BOARD OF ALL NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS TO KEEP THEM SAFE.

BETTER YET, REPLACE NUCLEAR POWER WITH SOLAR AND WIND AND PROTECT OUR LIVES AND THE PLANET NOW!

Sincerely,

Catherine Ziurella

Catherine Ziurella

110 S. Manhattan Ave.

Apt. 77

Tampa, FL 33609

From: susan peirce <speirce@prodigy.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 8:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

susan peirce

143 Eagle Feather Way

Lyons, CO 80540

From: kimberly skarda anderson <kimskarda@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 8:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

kimberly skarda anderson

14 opal commons

eastsound, WA 98245

From: Cathy Lester <catlest@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 8:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:"Interim" Radwaste storage is unacceptable

I understand that we have to do something about the radioactive waste problem. Thank you for focusing on it. It should be of utmost priority. However, I having looked at the draft, I am afraid the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Cathy Lester

605 Park Street

Grayling, MI 49738

From: Lydia Garvey <wolfhowlmama@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 8:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

lydia garvey

429 s 24th st

Clinton, OK 73601

From: Norm Littlejohn <norm.littlejohn@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 8:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Norm Littlejohn

Madison, WI 53703

From: Betty J. Van Wicklen <g10121@care2.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 8:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Betty J. Van Wicklen

41 Lake Shore Dr. #2B

Watervliet, NY 12189

From: Judy Coleman <jacoleman@peacemail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 8:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Judy Coleman

7634 Hamilton St.

Omaha, NE 68114

From: Natalie Van Leekwijck <hoepagirl@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Natalie Van Leekwijck

Beaverton, OR 97005

From: Whitney Nieman <wmsea@taosnet.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Whitney Nieman

PO Box 357

El Prado, NM 87529

From: Dolores O'Dowd <sda_albion@rochester.rr.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dolores O'Dowd

Caroline

caroline

Albion, NY 14411

From: Jan Reynolds <janreynolds1111@att.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jan Reynolds

1412 W. 12th Street

Bloomington, IN 47404

From: Phil Lusk <plusk@pipeline.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Phil Lusk

404 S Washington Street

82 Westwind Drive

Port Angeles, WA 98362

From: Phil Lusk <plusk@pipeline.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Phil Lusk

404 S Washington Street

82 Westwind Drive

Port Angeles, WA 98362

From: Martin Landa <marty@faceuptopeace.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Martin Landa

Siesta Lane

2137 Savannah River Street

Sedona, AZ 86351

From: Jonathan Baker <jbakerjonathan@netscape.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Baker

920 Naugles Drive

Mattituck, NY 11952

From: Paul White <Paul.a.white@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Paul White

289 south 200 east

Apt 2

Cedar city, UT 84720

From: Nancy Black <themotheriam@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nancy Black

26 Gum Tree Pl

St. Charles, MO 63301

From: Dennis Hoerner <dhoerner@earthlink.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dennis Hoerner

1374 E. 23rd Avenue

Eugene, OR 97403

From: Tara Verbridge <taraverbridge@yahoo.ca>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Tara Verbridge

1345 Wescot

Windsor, MI 48004

From: Phyllis Oster <poster30@wcnet.org>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Oster

1719 Juniper Dr.

1719 Juniper Dr.

Bowling Green, OH 43402

From: Jean-Luc VIALARD <jeanlucvialard@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jean-Luc VIALARD

15 Avenue Anatole de Monzie

CAHORS, ot 46000

From: Darlene Jakusz <jdjakusz@wi-net.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Darlene Jakusz

8380 Ambrose Lane

Amherst Jct., WI 54407

From: MOUVEMENT CITOYEN LOTOIS POUR LA SORTIE DU NUCLEAIRE <mclsdn@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

MOUVEMENT CITOYEN LOTOIS POUR LA SORTIE DU NUCLEAIRE

538 Chemin de Peyrolis

CAHORS, ot 46000

From: kate yavenditti <kateyav@cox.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

kate yavenditti

2467 marilouise way

san diego, CA 92103

From: Linda Leeuwrik <lleeuwrik@q.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Linda Leeuwrik

835 E Halliday St

Pocatello, ID 83201

From: Linda Wilscam <lilprngcat@earthlink.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Linda Wilscam

161 East Main St

Apt #12

Rockville, CT 06066

From: Beth Niederman <bethyandgarrett@xmission.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Beth Niederman

974 E 700 South

974 E 700 South

Salt Lake City, UT 84102

From: Winthrop Southworth <southworthw@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Many thanks for focusing on the most crucial radioactive waste problem. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all; it is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/ Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

The desperate need is to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future, rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a totally inadequate program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is most imperative.

The "discussion draft" needs to be re-examined and rewritten.

Sincerely,

Winthrop Southworth

CPO 6105- Warren Wilson College

PO Box 9000

Asheville, NC 28815

From: Janet Robinson <bocacatlover@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Janet Robinson

6391 Toulon Dr.

Boca Raton, FL 33433

From: PatriciaM Miller <patsyjeeter@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

PatriciaM Miller

1962 Hope ST.

s

San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

From: Ellen Thomas <et@prop1.org>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ellen Thomas

354 Woodland Drive

Tryon NC 28782

Tryon, NC 28782

From: Jane Davidson <romjulcat@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jane Davidson

435 Valley View Road

Englewood, NJ 07631

From: Margery Coffey <margerycoffey@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Margery Coffey

P.O. Box 279

none

Rosalie, NE 68055

From: Birgit Walch <birgitwalch@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Birgit Walch

480 Stone Church Rd E

Hamilton, ON L8W 0B1

From: Joanne Dixon <jvdix@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joanne Dixon

Colorado Springs, CO 80911

From: martha leahy <martha638@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

martha leahy

39 lockeland rd

39 lockeland rd

winchester, MA 01890

From: martha leahy <martha638@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 5:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

martha leahy

39 lockeland rd

39 lockeland rd

winchester, MA 01890

From: Lisa Hammermeister <necrohead56@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 5:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lisa Hammermeister

16456 Shamhart Dr.

Granada Hills, CA 91344

From: Linda voith <whollycow@earthlink.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 5:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Linda voith

7326 Gleason hill rd

Belfast, NY 14711

From: Jon Anderholm <xunbio@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 5:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jon Anderholm

1600 Niestrath

Cazadero, CA 95421

From: Victoria Pitchford <goth_girl45@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 5:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Victoria Pitchford

670 W. Wayman Street

Chicago, IL 60661

From: Robert Orlando <robhood00@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 5:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Robert Orlando

4705 State Highway 28

4705 State Highway 28

Cooperstown, NY 13326

From: Vic Burton <cvburton@swbell.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 5:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Vic Burton

5837 Grand Ave.

Kansas City, MO 64113

From: jeff hopkins <jhop-90@earthlink.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 5:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

jeff hopkins

69 amber court

Lindenhurst, IL 60046

From: Walt Kleine <Wkleine@netwiz.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 5:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Walt Kleine

3267 Hollis

Oakland, CA 94608

From: Ray Legault <rdlegault@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 5:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ray Legault

11825 se 221 st

11825 SE 221 ST

kent, WA 98031

From: Debra Tate <dttomatoes@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 5:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Debra Tate

PO Box 788

Gibsonton, FL 33534

From: Debra Tate <dttomatoes@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 5:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Debra Tate

PO Box 788

Gibsonton, FL 33534

From: Betty Scholten <bscholtenc@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 5:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Betty Scholten

PO Box 645

Clatskanie, OR 97016

From: Shari Katz <shari.katz@att.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Shari Katz

729 Megan Court

Westmont, IL 60559

From: Karen Sankey <ksankey@verizon.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Karen Sankey

12 Jamies Path

Plymouth, MA 02360

From: Lynn Walker <mooncrone@mac.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lynn Walker

15901 Corsica Ave

Cleveland, OH 44110

From: Gene and Dori Peters <petersgd@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

Please focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Thank you,

Peace!

Gene and Dori Peters

10149 W. Loma Blanca

Sun City, AZ 85351

From: karen stickney <kstick35@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

karen stickney

27 barrel street

lewiston, ME 04240

From: Nathan Judy <nathanejudy@lavabit.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nathan Judy

2 W. 70th St.

Kansas City, MO 64113

From: susan michetti <stardust10000@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

susan michetti

605 sheila st

605 sheila st. Mt Horeb WI 53572

mt horeb, WI 53572

From: Ronald and Joyce Mason <ronjoymason@aol.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ronald and Joyce Mason

30840 Running Stream #21

30840 Running Stream #21

Farmington Hills, MI 48334

From: Giancarlo Bruno <InstantKarma723@aim.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Giancarlo Bruno

10 Lettie Lane Wanaque, NJ

Wanaque, NJ 07465

From: William Kinsella <wjkinsel@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry cask containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. Consolidated interim storage would increase the risks of accidents and

security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that. Proceeding in this manner will ensure an endless round of costly legal challenges, wasting valuable time needed for developing a genuine solution.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

William Kinsella

3020 Sylvania Drive

#020 Sylvania Drive

Raleigh, NC 27607

From: Joseph Mustion <jmustion@tampabay.rr.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joseph Mustion

2906 Arrowsmith Rd

xx

Wimauma, FL 33598

From: Joseph Mustion <jmusion@tampabay.rr.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joseph Mustion

2906 Arrowsmith Rd

xx

Wimauma, FL 33598

From: Lois Jordan <lmjor@aol.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lois Jordan

9161 E. Walnut Tree Dr.

Tucson, AZ 85749

From: Phyllis Miller <jeanmiller.miller37@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Miller

427 Marlborough St., Apartment 4

Apartment 4

Boston, MA 02115

From: Karen Peralta <karenperalta51@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Karen Peralta

PO Box 82876

#8

Kenmore, WA 98028

From: M Andrus <mimiann.7782@verizon.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

M Andrus

313 Midori Ln

Calimesa, CA 92320

From: Allen Townsend <saltspray77@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Allen Townsend

143Walton Avenue

San Antonio, TX 78225

From: Lynn Walker <mooncrone@mac.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 3:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lynn Walker

15901 Corsica Ave

Cleveland, OH 44110

From: Jerome Zornesky <janhankuszor@verizon.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 3:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jerome Zornesky

460 Berkshire Road

Ridgewood, NJ 07450

From: Thomas Eppes <tf16123@aol.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 3:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for future generations of citizens rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources as Germany is doing. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Thomas Eppes

9401 E. Fowler Avenue

9401 E. Fowler Ave., Thonotosassa, FL

Thonotosassa, FL 33592

From: Georgeann Calendine <calendine@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 3:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Georgeann Calendine

342 West Temple Court SW

342 West Temple Court SW

Vero Beach, FL 32968

From: rosemary rehm <naveeno@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 3:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

rosemary rehm

217 center street

san rafael, CA 94901

From: Janet Maker <jamaker2001@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 3:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Janet Maker

925 Malcolm Ave

925 malcolm av

Los Angeles, CA 90024

From: Molly Fleming <mcflaming@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 3:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Molly Fleming

425 Flynn Avenue

425 Flynn Avenue

Burlington, VT 05401

From: Susan Willhoit <susan.willhoit@cox.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 2:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Susan Willhoit

326 Chesterfield Drive

Cardiff by the Sea,, CA 92007

From: jerry malamud <aabs@aol.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 2:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

jerry malamud

5562 Caminito Consuelo

La Jolla, CA 92037

From: Tom Howell <tom.howell@mindspring.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 2:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Tom Howell

725-D Montague Road

Columbia, SC 29209

From: Lauralee Humphrey <Llhumphrey205@aol.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 2:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lauralee Humphrey

205 Lynncrest Ct.

Lutherville, MD 21093

From: Donald Warren RN <deadlinedon@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 2:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Donald Warren RN

5 east shore drive

5 East Shore Drive, Asheville,NC

Asheville, NC 28805

From: Abdessalam Diab <friendiab@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 2:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Abdessalam Diab

6 Algazaer St. Almohandseen

Giza, ot 12411

From: Gene and Dori Peters <petersgene@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 2:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

Please focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Thank you.

Peace!

Gene and Dori Peters

204 W. Havens, # 150

Mitchell, SD 57301

From: Marcia Hoodwin <marcia@accentsaway.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 2:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marcia Hoodwin

8236 Shadow Pine Way

Don't send a receipt; thanks!

Sarasota, FL 34238

From: Nick Mantas <nickmantas@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 2:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nick Mantas

372 Wilson Avenue

Township of Washington, NJ 07676

From: Hugh Moore <hmpeace1@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 2:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Hugh Moore

166 N 1st Street Unit 4

Unit 4

El Cajon, CA 92021

From: Jim Bell <jimbellels@cox.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 2:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jim Bell

4862 Voltaire St.

4862 Voltaire St.

San Diego, CA 92107

From: Donna Boyle <dboyle101@cox.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Radioactive waste is a high priority problem. But the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems. No. It is time, it is past time, to resolve the issue and stop adding to the wallpaper pasted over it.

Moving toxic stuff to temporary graveyards is an illusion, not a fix. The companies that generate the waste are responsible for its custody and care, as is true in any other industry. Why should our fragile environment or the taxpayers be expected to absorb the waste or to clean up after them?

Every generator must keep its waste safely onsite AND develop a permanent solution – its enclosure in a solid shield that can withstand any challenge until the radioactivity is extinguished, possibly thousands or millions of years. Probably they would prefer to develop alternate sources of energy. So much the better.

If the site runs out of space, they must cease and desist from creating more waste; i.e., they must shut down their reactors.

Your "discussion draft" must include that final solution. This is not a volleyball game, and we can't continue to keep the ball up in the air, in play forever, or even for a short while longer.

Sincerely,

Donna Boyle

San Diego, CA

dboyle101@cox.net

Donna Boyle

San Diego, CA 92104

From: wendy weikel <ww4nature@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

wendy weikel

1015 sierra st.

1015 Sierra St.

berkeley, CA 94707

From: Jim Lieberman <jl@lieblet.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: definition of HLW

Attachments: 11462.pdf

Based on my experience at the NRC and consulting work at DOE, I believe it is in the nation's interest to treat waste incidental to reprocessing as different than high-level waste. The definition of HLW used at Idaho and Savannah River sites authorized by Section 3116 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act

results in a cost effective way to safely dispose of this material that would otherwise be considered HLW. I recommend that HLW be defined to exclude waste incidental to reprocessing (WIR). It is important to have this clearly stated in any HLW legislation. I have attached a paper that provides more information about the history of the definition of HLW and WIR.

--

Best Regards

Jim Lieberman

Regulatory and Nuclear Consultant

Cell: 301-526-4790

e-mail: jl@lieblet.com

The information contained in this message from Jim Lieberman and any attachments are confidential and intended only for the named recipient(s). If you have received this message in error, you are prohibited from copying, distributing or using the information. Please contact the sender immediately by return email and delete the original message.

From: Deb Brown <deb@oltexts.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Deb Brown

PO Box 98964

Raleigh, NC 27614

From: Suzanne Tompkins <suzihugatree@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Tompkins

Via de Angeles

San Clemente, CA 92672

From: Steve Branch <shb4123@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Steve Branch

88 Edgehill

Providence, RI 02906

From: R. Marti <rjmarti@earthlink.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

R. Marti

1800 Midick

Altadena, CA 91001

From: J.A. Dingman <jdingman11@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

J.A. Dingman

P.O. Box 10796

2602 Gracewood Dr.

Greensboro, NC 27408

From: Victoria De Goff and family <vjdrs@pacbell.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Victoria De Goff and family

1916 Los Angeles

Berkeley, CA 94707

From: Richard Sherman and family <vjdrsg@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Richard Sherman and family

1916 Los Angeles

BErkeley, CA 94707

From: Nicole Maschke <nicolemaschke@att.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nicole Maschke

4802 Gedeon Avenue

Cleveland, OH 44102

From: Barbara Binns <dbbinns@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Barbara Binns

764 S. Sierra Ave.

Solana Beach, CA 92075

From: Marcus M. McCallen III <mccallen@mcn.org>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marcus M. McCallen III

10401 Nichols Lane

Mendocino, CA 95460

From: joy cash <hilobliss@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

joy cash

3657 Vermont St

San Diego, CA 92103

From: Michael Zmolek <mike.zmolek@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michael Zmolek

707 S 20 Ave W

707 S 20 Ave W, Newton, IA 50208

Newton, IA 52240

From: Joseph Duerksen <josephduerksen@att.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joseph Duerksen

4407 W 54th Ter.

4407 W 54h Ter, Roeland Park, KS 66205

Roeland Park, KS 66205

From: Louis Cox <louis@peaceforearth.org>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Louis Cox

360 Toad Rd.

Charlotte, VT 05445

From: Patricia Cabarga <pphelan@nc.rr.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patricia Cabarga

Chapel Hill, NC 27514

From: Margarita Haugaard <margarita-h@cox.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Margarita Haugaard

36060 indiana street

san diego, CA 92103

From: Arnie Schoenberg <arnieds@cox.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Arnie Schoenberg

3345 Gregory St.

San Diego, CA 92104

From: Emma Spurgin Hussey <spurginhussey@wildmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Emma Spurgin Hussey

Fitzgerald Road

Burdett, NY 14818

From: Dorothy Lynn Brooks <amberitha@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Lynn Brooks

720 Briatwood Blvd.

Arlington, TX 76013

From: Ben Oscar Andersson <oscarsito1057@wildmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ben Oscar Andersson

55 My Street

My Hometown, IL 60601

From: Nanci Oechsle <dishesbite@cox.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:49 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nanci Oechsle

2438 Alta Vista Dr

Vista, CA 92084

From: Van Aggson <van.a@cox.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:46 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Van Aggson

9025 LEMON AVE

LA MESA, CA 91941

From: Rosalind Zitner <rozzitner@aol.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:40 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rosalind Zitner

83 Pine Hill Rd

Great Neck, NY 11020

From: Vi Mooberry <vmooberry@cox.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:35 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Vi Mooberry

1170 Rising Hill

Escondido, CA 92029

From: Elizabeth Hunter <mehunter7@aol.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:33 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Rad waste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Hunter

1125 W. Willetta St.

1125 W. Willetta St.

Phoenix, AZ 85007

From: Leon Trumpp <aquatek@iland.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:32 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Leon Trumpp

1703 W. 9th

1703 W 9th

Sedalia, MO 65301

From: Marcia Patt <marciapatt@cox.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:29 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marcia Patt

3511 Park Blvd. #3

San Diego, CA 92103

From: rick bissonnette <rcebissy@roadrunner.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:16 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

rick bissonnette

849 lindley ave

849 lindley ave.

cuyahoga falls, OH 44223

From: William Le Bon <b_lebon@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:12 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

William Le Bon

po box 7657

Santa Cruz, CA 95061

From: Steve Branch <shb4123@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:03 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Steve Branch

88 Edgehill

Providence, RI 02906

From: Cori Bishop <animeluvr666@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:01 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Cori Bishop

PO Box 1154

Brigantine, NJ 08203

From: Casey Heisler <caseyfheisler@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:00 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Casey Heisler

7135 W Villa Chula

Glendale, AZ 85310

From: Patrick Brown <weast@shaw.ca>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:53 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patrick Brown

Nelson, BC V1L6R2

From: Frances Whitman <fwhitman@greynun.org>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:49 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Frances Whitman

1750 Quarry Road

Yardley PA 19067

Yardley, PA 19067

From: Lisa Neste <lilmouse1213@earthlink.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:29 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lisa Neste

4437 Garden Club St.

4437 Garden Club St.

High Point, NC 27265

From: Melissa Atkinson <melissa@ballroomdancers.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:25 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Melissa Atkinson

10647 Ashby Ave

Los Angeles, CA 90064

From: Michael Distefano <firecat@iname.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:16 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michael Distefano

11809 Pittson Road

silver spring, MD 20906

From: Michael Distefano <firecat@iname.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:15 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michael Distefano

11809 Pittson Road

silver spring, MD 20906

From: Laura Saxon <lrsaxon9@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:10 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Laura Saxon

145TH ave rd

Morrison, FL 32668

From: Christina Moodie <moodswt@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:10 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Christina Moodie

721 W. Las Lomas Rd.

Tucson, AZ 85704

From: Dana Bleckinger <dbleckinger@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 10:01 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dana Bleckinger

3153 SW Dolph Ct. #13

Yachats, OR 97498

From: Anne Padilla <groesa@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:51 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Anne Padilla

2100 Calle de la Vuelta

Santa Fe, NM 87505

From: Walker Everette <hairdryerdog@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:37 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Walker Everette

Nyack, NY 10960

From: Hydee Dullam <Hdullam@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:36 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Hydee Dullam

155 Ramona Pl.

Camarillo, CA 93010

From: Hugo Loquet <Dhaulagiri@skynet.be>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:35 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Hugo Loquet

Louis Van Regenmortellei 29

Borsbeel, ot 2150

From: Mike Mari <mikeym_m@vegemail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:24 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mike Mari

838 Van Buren St

Herndon, VA 20170

From: Debbie Williamson <williamsondebbie2@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:21 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Debbie Williamson

P.O. Box 21

Mountain Home, AR 72654

From: Michael Kirkby <kirkbymichael@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:13 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michael Kirkby

9 Albany Ave.

9 Albany Ave.

Toronto, ON M5R 3C2

From: Leslie Limberg <llimberg@aol.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:08 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Leslie Limberg

102 red fern lane

102 Red Fern Lane

w, MO 63385

From: Joan Hennessey <words@jeannesavage.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:06 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joan Hennessey

106 great western rd

South Dennis, MA 02660

From: Julie Alley <juliesbooks@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 8:57 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Julie Alley

3553 Atlantic Avenue

Suite 353

Long Beach, CA 90807

From: Susan Broadhead <s_broadhead@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 8:54 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

I am writing to thank you for addressing the radioactive waste problem. At the same time, I would like to express my concern over the interim site proposal in the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation. I believe that this proposal, if enacted, would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Susan Broadhead

328 Martins Creek Road

Barnardsville, NC 28709

From: Daniel Doran, Ph.D. <be_well@emailplus.org>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 8:34 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Daniel Doran, Ph.D.

600 W. 3 1/2 Mile

Cultivating Wholeness Center

Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783

From: David Lees <grobone@comcast.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 8:15 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Lees

41 Topsfield Rd.

Ipswich, MA 01938

From: Ann Reed <cam8002@care2.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 8:00 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ann Reed

1622 N 2ND ST

QUINCY, IL 62301

From: pat korzendorfer <jerpatkorzen@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:44 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

pat korzendorfer

p o box 247

20 north court

fort atkinson, IA 52144

From: Gloria Picchetti <picchetti707@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:30 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gloria Picchetti

553 W Oakdale

apt 312

Chicago, IL 60657

From: danielle gaynor <danielle_gaynor@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:23 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

The fact that an acceptable, safe solution to this problem has not yet been found is proof that insufficient thought was given to the matter of approving nuclear power plants to begin with. If we add the financial costs and safety risks to the overall picture, we see what an enormous mistake it has been to go down a nuclear path to meet our energy needs.

So, unless you are willing to store these materials in your own home - putting your own self, family and community at risk, please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

danielle gaynor

2546 Pleasant St

oakland, CA 94602

From: Richard Heinlein <muhwase@wildmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:20 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Richard Heinlein

PO Box 152

PO Box 152

Trevor, WI 53179

From: Patrick Dreier <patrick.dreier@gmx.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 7:07 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways—even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome—yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry—which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources, renewables energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patrick Dreier

Industrie 10

Industrie 10, ot 2114

From: Cecily Westermann <cwestermann@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:30 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Cecily Westermann

Saint Louis, MO 63139

From: Kathryn Peterson <kitkatmcla@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:16 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Peterson

3146 SE 54th Ave

Portland, OR 97206

From: Jerry and Lois Wharton/Putzier <jwhar76024@aol.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:11 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jerry and Lois Wharton/Putzier

5033 E. 23rd St.

na

Tucson, AZ 85711

From: Roger Santerre <rpswindspirit@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:06 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Roger Santerre

10 Canaan Rd.

New Paltz, NY 12561

From: Ana Alvarez <aairis@aol.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 6:05 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ana Alvarez

11500 Brandiwine Ct.

Clermont, FL 34711

From: Anna Undebeck <anna17@hotmail.se>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 5:47 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Anna Undebeck

västerlånggatan 20

Kristinehamnristinehamn, NV 68130

From: Birgitta Siponen <hipuldi@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 5:31 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Birgitta Siponen

Puulinnankatu 4

Oulu, ot 90570

From: Nancy Holland <ommthree@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 5:00 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nancy Holland

19 Mechanic Street

Shelburne falls, MA 01370

From: Rob Jursa <info@blakksphere.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:40 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rob Jursa

Liesingtalstrasse 117

Liesingtalstrasse 117

Breitenfurt, ot 2384

From: Jonathan Bailin <jonathan4web@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 4:30 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Bailin

1111 No Street

Los Angeles, CA 90066

From: Krista Parker <parker.krista@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 3:59 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Krista Parker

225 Wellesley St. E.

Toronto, AB T5P 1M8

From: Adam Fisher <master.damsk@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 3:58 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Adam Fisher

Emsworth, ot PO10 8EF

From: Renee and Robert Pound <parodux@astound.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 3:56 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Renee and Robert Pound

1400 Abbey Ct.

Concord, CA 94518

From: Ridwaana Allen <Rallen7@scmail.spelman.edu>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 3:52 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ridwaana Allen

1249 England terrace

Hampton, GA 30228

From: CP Wren <wrenstir@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 3:49 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

CP Wren

Allston Way

Berkeley, CA 94712

From: Mariangela Monterisi <marmonter@libero.it>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 3:48 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mariangela Monterisi

Bisceglie, ot 70052

From: k olson <servimailster@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 3:33 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

k olson

21325 Heron Dr

21325 Heron Dr.

bodega bay, CA 94923

From: Marshall Arnold <marshall.arnold@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 3:22 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marshall Arnold

1359 N Maplewood

Chicago, IL 60622

From: Helen Porter <ZeeKallah@Yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 3:07 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Helen Porter

5001 N. 11th Ave.

E201

Phoenix, AZ 85013

From: Sheila Garrett <slgsheila@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 2:53 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft

Thank you for working on the radioactive waste problem. The high-level radioactive waste program is broken and the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation only continues the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to an interim site would not fix anything. Protection of public health, safety and security requires moving deadly radioactive waste as little as possible. The waste should only be moved to dry containers at the same reactor site then to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems and guarantee increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

The de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution only delays permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and makes it more likely that a temporary, unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. This proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future, not on the interests of the nuclear power industry-- the only beneficiary this program. The best way to limit the radioactive waste problem is to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. For the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Sincerely,

Sheila Garrett

PO Box 305

Ashfield, MA 01330

From: Rodney and Terri Jones <rjnhugo@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 2:31 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rodney and Terri Jones

3255 E 2120 Rd

n/a

Hugo, OK 74743

From: Peter Saltanis <Pjsalt@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 2:09 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Peter Saltanis

326 Moose Hill Rd.

Monroe, CT 06468

From: Arthur Riding <sanayhah@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 2:02 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Arthur Riding

Elsfield, Crafts End, Chilton

Didcot, ot OX110SA

From: Donna Napier <donna napier@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:48 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Donna Napier

2256 Corinthian Ct

Eugene, OR 97405

From: Darrell Clarke <darrell@dclarke.org>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:46 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Darrell Clarke

Castaic, CA 91384

From: Susie Jason <susieq@mcn.org>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:39 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Susie Jason

p.o. box 608

Ft. Bragg, CA 95437

From: Chris Jenkins <jep7.cj@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:39 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Chris Jenkins

3305 Bader Ave.

Cleveland, OH 44109

From: Richard Arrindell <rarrundell@netscape.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:30 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Richard Arrindell

1563 Grandview Way

Melbourne, FL 32935

From: Mollie Thomas <grouseridgetower@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:20 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mollie Thomas

1506 Bethel St. NE

Olympia, WA 98532

From: Pat and Gary Gover <govers@bellsouth.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:18 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Pat and Gary Gover

300 Lincoln St.

Fairhope, AL 36532

From: Lorna Farnum <lorna.skip@gte.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:09 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lorna Farnum

3305 Druid Ln.

3305 Druid Ln.

Rossmoor, CA 90720

From: Judy Brouillette <jfbtyndrum@knology.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:04 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Judy Brouillette

2815 17th Avenue

Columbus, GA 31901

From: Susan Selbin <sselbin@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:01 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Susan Selbin

2431 Northwest Cir NW

Albuquerque, NM 87104

From: Nancy Chismar <nanlc999@optonline.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:54 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nancy Chismar

6 York Dr Apt 6A

Edison, NJ 08817

From: Sybil Kohl <sybkohl@msn.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:49 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sybil Kohl

18103 NE 159th Ave

18103 N.E. 159th Ave.

Brush Prairie, WA 98606

From: Cynthia Groves, Groves, Retired Health Care Practice Mgmt. Consult
<be@taotoearthmpubs.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:43 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Groves, Groves, Retired Health Care Practice Mgmt. Consult

105 Kulipuu St.

105 Kulipuu St.

Kihei, HI 96753

From: Don Heyse <don@heyse.org>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:29 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Don Heyse

1842 Corriedale Dr

Fort Collins, CO 80526

From: Stephanie Trasoff <strasoff@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:27 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Trasoff

5160 Seaview Dr

Blaine, WA 98230

From: Crystal Conklin <eidhlyn@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:05 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Crystal Conklin

5902 W Royal Palm

#82

Glendale, AZ 85302

From: Jennifer Hayes <xandysmom@aol.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:00 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Hayes

2312 St. James Pl.

Modesto, CA 95350

From: H James <relating2u@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 11:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

"Interim" storage does not benefit the public; rather it is a long-time nuclear industry goal. The utilities are liable for radioactive waste when it's on their property; when it's moved outside their gates, we taxpayers are liable. That's the real reason the industry wants this non-solution to the waste problem.

Current on-site storage of radioactive waste is inadequate. Fuel pools are overly full, are generally outside containment, and need offsite electric power to maintain cooling. Waste should be removed from pools at the earliest time possible and put into secure dry casks sited and hardened to prevent attack or destruction by natural disaster.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

H James

4042 N Harding

Chicago, IL 60618

From: Gail Linneron <GLinnerkin@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 11:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gail Linnerson

719 9th Ave SE

719 9th Ave SE

Minneapolis, MN 55414

From: M Ddayton <teachers12@q.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 11:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

M Ddayton

OV, AZ 85737

From: Judith Abel <mohawkwoman2@ymail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 11:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Judith Abel

4183 Wellman Road

McLouth, KS 66054

From: Russell Lowes <russlowes@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 11:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Russell Lowes

3339 E. Seneca St.

Tucson, AZ 85716

From: Nancy Bengtson <ninaiis@npgcable.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 11:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nancy Bengtson

165 Verde Valley School Road

Sedona AZ, AZ 86351

From: Gerda Seaman <gerda@segall.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 11:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gerda Seaman

1020 Macy Avenue

Chico, CA 95926

From: william albin <wla941@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 11:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

william albin

965 amber loop

grass valley, CA 95945

From: James Ploger <jploger@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 11:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

James Ploger

1909 S Charles St

1909 S Charles St

Seattle, WA 98144

From: Anatta Blackmarr <anatta@sandoth.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 10:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Anatta Blackmarr

14207 SE Fair Oaks Ave.

Portland, OR 97267

From: Kathy Levine <klevine5@optonline.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 10:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

I agree with the contents of this letter. I'm very concerned about radioactive waste and moving it around just makes things worse!

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kathy Levine

1408 Ditmas Ave.

1408 Ditmas Ave.

Brooklyn, NY 11226

From: Nathan Vogel <doctorspook@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 10:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nathan Vogel

49 alpine terrace

San Francisco, CA 94117

From: Jane Affonso <jgaffonso@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 10:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jane Affonso

1919 Belmont Lane

1919 Belmont Lane

Redondo Beach, CA 90278

From: john ventre <jv3free@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 10:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

john ventre

700 shumont rd

bl. mt., NC 28711

From: Janet Marsh <meditate@bigpond.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 10:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Janet Marsh

Dunskey Place

Dunskey Place

Denmark, ot 6333

From: Carla Haim <norma.haim@verizon.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 10:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carla Haim

2706 Irvington Ave.

San Bernardino, CA 92407

From: joseph hunt <josephmhunt@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 10:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

joseph hunt

59 edwin street

dorchester, MA 02124

From: Jennifer Griffith <jbgrif@mindspring.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 10:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Griffith

315 Obie Dr.

Durham, NC 27713

From: David Frey <Freyguy13@comcast.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 10:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Frey

9751 Longfield dr.

Huntley, IL 60142

From: June Adler <juneadler@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 10:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

June Adler

509 N. 7th St.

509 N. 7th St.

Alpine, TX 79830

From: Dr. William J. Sneck, S.J., Ph.D. <Bsneck@jesuitcenter.org>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 10:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dr. William J. Sneck, S.J., Ph.D.

501 N. Church Rd.

Wernersville,, PA 19565

From: Louise Scott <LouisescottCA@Gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 10:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Louise Scott

2880 Edison

Graton, CA 95444

From: Barbara Tombleson <bjt@coho.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 10:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Barbara Tomblason

7526 SW Capitol Hill Rd.

7526 SW Capitol Hill Rd.

Portland, OR 97219

From: Susaan Aram <mermaidlaguna@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 9:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Susaan Aram

1361 Terrace Way

Laguna Beach, CA 92651

From: Joel Hildebrandt <senorjoel@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 9:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joel Hildebrandt

3044a Halcyon Ct

Berkeley, CA 94705

From: Amerval Du Planty <amerval@dccnet.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 9:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal waste to indefinite storage is not the appropriate solution to this problem! The first step is to halt the PRODUCTION of all waste. Immediately FULL RESOURCES are to be brought to bear on research to discover a method for NEUTRALIZING the radioactive waste and rendering it benign in the environment. Secondly: FULL RESOURCES are to be applied to researching appropriate ENERGY ALTERNATIVES. The Keshe Foundation (www.keshefoundation.org) has just as recently as January 2013 advised the World that it is making FREELY available the technology plans for a Free Energy System it has developed. FREE because of the importance of no one Country wielding such a power over the World. The United States of America has assuredly ALREADY been in receipt of this information.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start addressing the appropriate issues of a) Neutralizing Radioactive Waste. b) Halting the Production of any additional Radioactive Waste. c) Begin earnest examination of alternative Energy production such as that offered by the Keshe Foundation.

Sincerely,

Amerval Du Planty

Amerval Du Planty

1104 Crowe Road

Roberts Creek, BC V0N 2W3

From: Lawrence Carroll <Lcarrollb@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 9:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Rad waste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Carroll

66 Carroll Road

66 Carroll Road

Huntsboro, AL 36860

From: Melinda Burgess <melindajf77@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 9:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Melinda Burgess

10156 Wisner Ave

Mission Hills, CA 91345

From: Jenny Thacker <jennythacker304@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 9:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radio active waste - your discussion draft is unacceptable

I'm glad you're trying to work on the radioactive waste problem. It's a horrible situation and it needs to be a high priority.

Unfortunately the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable.

Radio active waste should only be moved from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation.

A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program.

Please destroy your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jenny Thacker

223 Mason Dr

Harpers Ferry, WV 25425

From: Dimitri Stoupis <stoupis@msn.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 9:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dimitri Stoupis

12830 6th Str., Yucaipa

Yucaipa, CA 92399

From: cora cypser <bcypser@bestweb.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 9:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

cora cypser

16 Young Road

Katonah, NY 10536

From: Dante Renzoni <silentglide@tds.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 9:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dante Renzoni

W6821 Wester Ave

w6821 Wester AVE

Medford, WI 54451

From: Danielle Montague-Judd <ddmjudd@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 9:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Danielle Montague-Judd

1820 Fox Run Rd.

Wanship, UT 84017

From: Steve Shuput <sshuput@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 9:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Steve Shuput

690 N Caring Cove

690 N Caring Cove

Salt Lake City, UT 84103

From: Joanne Sauter <chitowntall@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 9:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joanne Sauter

50 E 16th St

Chicago, IL 60626

From: Barbara Haack <barhaack@verizon.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Barbara Haack

102 Main St

102 Main

West Newbury, MA 01985

From: William Seyfried <mseyfriedjr@msn.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

William Seyfried

701 California Ave

Boulder City, NV 89005

From: Laurie Solomon <star_fire145@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but this Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Laurie Solomon

POB 1342

Battle Ground, WA 98604

From: Jelica Roland <jroland@email.t-com.hr>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jelica Roland

Sv. Martin 64

Buzet, ot 52420

From: Michael Strawn <mjs55@juno.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Let's discuss the discussion draft

First, thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation completely fails to address the problems constructively.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is actually a really dumb idea. Who came up with it, a nuclear industry lobbyist? No one charged with protecting public health, safety, or security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly.

"Consolidated interim storage" (sometimes just called "storage" by nuclear backers) doesn't actually accomplish anything, as it would not reduce the number of sites now storing radioactive waste. Every reactor will remain a de facto waste dump that needs to be guarded, because spent fuel removed from reactors is too hot to be sent anywhere; it must be stored in pools for about five years. So consolidated interim storage would simply increase the number of sites by the number of "interim" sites.

"Interim" storage sites are by definition not suitable for permanent storage. Yet there is a very real risk that they would become permanent sites, as no state wants a permanent storage site within its borders. Once "interim" sites are established, it would be all too easy to simply continue them year after year, decade after decade, rather than come up with the permanent solution we need to the radioactive waste problem.

And if a permanent site is found, then the waste would need to be moved again -- a completely unnecessary risk. We know that accidents happen, and they are far more likely to occur when the waste is moving than when it is stationary.

Speaking of transporting waste, a single average truck-sized waste cask would carry the radiological equivalent of 40 Hiroshima bombs; a rail cask would hold 200 Hiroshima bombs worth of radiation. And tens of thousands of these casks would travel our nation's roads, railways and waterways over the next 30 years through major cities and across America's agricultural heartland -- just waiting for accidents to happen.

Does this sound like a good idea to you?

"Interim" storage does not benefit the public in any way whatsoever. So why do it? Because it's a long-time nuclear industry goal. The utilities are liable for radioactive waste when it's on their property; when it's moved outside their gates, the taxpayers become liable. That's the real reason the industry wants this non-solution to the waste problem -- so that someone else gets to accept the liability.

Please show some backbone by standing up to these lobbyists and do something for Americans: Say No to "consolidated interim storage."

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection, and equity for the future rather than on the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry, which would be the only beneficiary of such an ill-considered program. If you want to implement something that would benefit Americans who are not invested in or employed by the nuclear industry, Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) together with renewed work on finding a permanent solution is immensely preferable to what you have come up with.

What's HOSS? Well, current on-site storage of radioactive waste is inadequate: Fuel pools are overly full, are generally outside containment, and need offsite electric power to maintain cooling. To address these issues, waste should be removed from pools at the earliest time possible and put into secure dry casks sited and hardened to prevent attack or destruction by natural disaster. That's what HOSS is -- Hardened On-Site Storage.

While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site (HOSS). Other movement should be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails, and waterways -- even without an accident.

For these reasons, I urge you to scrap your "discussion draft" and start over. Please -- for the safety and finances of Americans. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michael Strawn

29631 Palomino Dr.

Warren, MI 48093

From: Laura Simpson <laura.simpson24@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Laura Simpson

Laura Simpson

P.O. Box 2926

Box 2926 McKinleyville, Ca. 95519

McKinleyville, CA 95519

From: Timothy Enloe <tenloe@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Timothy Enloe

Weller Court

weller ct.

Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

From: Mike Thomas <newsguy@rof.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mike Thomas

307 Elm Avenue

Rifle, CO 81650

From: David Johnson <dave.dlj@frontier.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Johnson

146 S 4th St

Buckley, WA 98321

From: Sibylle Schwarz <ssn@rupertsland.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sibylle Schwarz

P.O.Box: 6099

Eagle River, AK 99577

From: Karen Jacobsen <kjacobsen2001@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Karen Jacobsen

3414 Rte. 150

Box 259

East Schodack, NY 12063

From: Ella Melik <ella.melik@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ella Melik

11412 N King Arthur Drive

Spokane, WA 99218

From: Matthew Filler <matt@mattfiller.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Matthew Filler

233 Harvard Ln

Seal Beach, CA 90740

From: Pamela Allee <alleepa@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Pamela Allee

7425 N Portsmouth Ave

Portland, OR 97203

From: Carole Mathews <carole.mathews1@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carole Mathews

220 Highlands Ridge Pl SE

Smyrna, GA 30082

From: Irena Franchi <bluabirdo@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Irena Franchi

301 174 St 2206

Sunny Isle Beac, FL 33160

From: Darlene Barber Waldron <ojibwe@copper.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Darlene Barber Waldron

P.O. Box 475

Dannemora, NY 12929

From: David Garratt <dfgarratt@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Garratt

Buffalo, NY 14222

From: Mike Konopa <mkonopa@juno.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mike Konopa

60 Mann St

Irvine, CA 92612

From: Nancy Stone Dickinson <rdndjnsd@earthlink.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 7:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nancy Stone Dickinson

5173 N. Kenwood Avenue

5173 N. Kenwood Avenue

Indianapolis, IN 46208

From: Diane Steele <amazonwoman@frontiernet.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 7:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Diane Steele

613 Linden St.

Farmington

Farmington, MN 55024

From: Victoria Loudis <vrl243@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 7:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Victoria Loudis

248-15 Rushmore Ave.

Douglaston, NY 11363

From: Stephen and Robin Newberg <crashnewberg@netscape.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 7:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Stephen and Robin Newberg

146 Granville Rd

North Granby, CT 06060

From: ray trozzo <rtrozzo102@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 7:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

ray trozzo

3853 kittyhawk dr

3853 kittyhawk dr

fort myers, FL 33905

From: Linda Musmeci Kimball <Lmkocpj@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 7:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Linda Musmeci Kimball

724 Melinda Dr.

724 Melinda Dr., Oxford, OH 45056

Oxford, OH 45056

From: Dan Henneberger <enterdansworld@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 7:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dan Henneberger

12500 Culver blvd #119

12500 Culver blvd #119

Los Angeles, CA 90066

From: Leslie Burpo <lburpo@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 7:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Leslie Burpo

P.O. Box 5468

Eugene, OR 97405

From: Lee Greenawalt <Leegshack@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 7:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is ineffective, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems. 25,000,000 year radiation is not interim. Nuclear waste must not be moved around like peas under shells. Every movement is a problem. A permanent secure site is the only movement that should be made from the reactor of origin.

The waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways. Even more objectionable is the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump.

We must stop creating this problem. For the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Sincerely,

Lee Greenawalt

3141 N. Parsons Ave

Merced, CA 95340

From: Rosemary Doyle <rdoyle@cheerful.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 7:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Doyle

Pembroke

Livonia, MI 48152

From: Joyce H. Browning <jbrowning@npgcable.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 7:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joyce H. Browning

5 West Cottage Ave

Flagstaff, AZ 86001

From: Robert Linzmeier <musicman690@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Robert Linzmeier

950 E Wilmette Rd

Palatine, IL 60074

From: Timothy Cardiello <timcardiello@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Timothy Cardiello

23 Boston Ave

Medford, MA 02155

From: Edward Mainland <emainland@comcast.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

In my opinion, the mounting radioactive waste problem should get top priority in Congress. America's high-level radioactive waste program is broken. The Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only make a bad situation worse.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all but would shift the burden from industry to taxpayers. This is not acceptable. It is the height of irresponsibility for politicians to advocate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. Only the short

move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site is safe. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

You must put public health, environmental protection and equity first rather than kowtow to the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. Even better, to deal with the radioactive waste problem realistically is to phase out nuclear power entirely and replace it with clean, renewable energy sources, energy efficiency and conservation. We are stuck with the waste that already exists, and you ought to be working on Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed emphasis on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please junk this "discussion draft" and begin againr.

Sincerely,

Edward Mainland

1017 Bel Marin Keys Blvd.

1017 Bel Marin Keys Blvd.

Novato, CA 94949

From: Erica Grimm <forevergrimm@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Erica Grimm

3242 Hollydale Drive

Los Angeles, CA 90039

From: Kathy and Jim Penfold <jkpenfold@embarqmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kathy and Jim Penfold

Jefferson City, MO 65109

From: Patricia Jerrells <trisha7of9@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patricia Jerrells

320 SE Nighthawk Place

Shelton, WA 98584

From: Donn Simpson <pricklymountain@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Donn Simpson

493 Prickly MT.RD.

Main St.

Warren, VT 05674

From: Gary Jones <g.jones1965@att.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Instead of allowing Big Nuke to dump their waste costs on someone else and spread it around, please leave the trans-uranic material on site where it's already being guarded. It may end up as future fuel for a new generation of reactor, assuming the new technology is safe and viable, and that's a pretty big assumption.

I certainly don't want this stuff being trucked passed my back yard. Joliet is too big to evacuate, and it would probably be too late for that if there were an accident or terrorists sabotaged the nearby railroad.

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gary Jones

608 W. Marion St.

Joliet, IL 60436

From: Byron Byers <ted@tedbyers.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Byron Byers

6109 So C St

6109 So C St

Tacoma, WA 98408

From: Byron Byers <ted@tedbyers.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Byron Byers

6109 So C St

6109 So C St

Tacoma, WA 98408

From: Jadwiga Reinke <jadwigareinke@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jadwiga Reinke

846 Yuba St.

Redding, CA 96001

From: SUE E. DEAN <DEANKS@JUNO.COM>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

SUE E. DEAN

33945 N. 66TH WAY

33945 N. 66th Way

SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85266

From: SUE E. DEAN <DEANKS@JUNO.COM>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

SUE E. DEAN

33945 N. 66TH WAY

33945 N. 66th Way

SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85266

From: Lindsay Black <lindzb@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lindsay Black

P.O. Box 1206

Santa Cruz, CA 95061

From: Dennis Nelson <dennis_nelson@att.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

You need to accept once and for all that nuclear power is neither safe nor clean. A disaster such as the "permanent" radioactive contamination near the Fukushima plant should have made that fact abundantly clear to any thinking person by now.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dennis Nelson, Ph.D.

Dennis Nelson

10952 Decatur Road

10952 Decatur Road, San Diego

San Diego, CA 92126

From: Anita Wessling <w2fruit@ozarkmountains.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Anita Wessling

13886 Hwy 396

Omaha, AR 72662

From: Roberta Peters <bobbi10267@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Roberta Peters

172 Centre Street

Mountain View, CA 94041

From: Lionel Ortiz <brownbuffalo@suddenlink.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lionel Ortiz

2820 Graham Rd

none

Bayside, CA 95524

From: Rachael Denny <stormdragon71@netscape.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

I am writing, in part, to thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem, which should be a very high priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

With all this in mind, I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

In summary, I would respectfully urge you to go back to the drawing board and start over. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rachael Denny

4082 Interlake Road

Bradley, CA 93426

From: Beth Angel <angel_computer_llc@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Beth Angel

PO Box 118

Cobalt, CT 06424

From: Sally Hayati <sallyhayati@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sally Hayati

466 Calle de Aragon

Redondo Beach, CA 90277

From: Jonathan Mobley <Jthin@msn.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Mobley

Hc 33 #38

Pettigrew, AR 72701

From: shelva Wood <shelvajwood2004@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

shelva Wood

1016 Acadia Drive

Plano, TX 75023

From: DEBORAH SMITH <deborah993@cox.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

THIS IS A PROBLEM, AND A VERY SERIOUS ONE!!!

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

DEBORAH SMITH

3044 N.W. 30TH

3044 N.W. 30TH

OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73112

From: Colleen Lobel <clobel1@san.rr.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Colleen Lobel

8111 Kenova St

San Diego

CA 92126, CA 92126

From: Sandra Mikulich <smikulich@prodigy.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sandra Mikulich

11425 Burton

11425 Burton

Sugar Creek, MO 64054

From: Daryl Gale <turtleperson@earthlink.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Daryl Gale

456 S. Main St. #419

Los Angeles, CA 90013

From: William Davis <rees@hvc.rr.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is totally unacceptable

Thank you for finally focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. Nuclear energy should never have been developed until this problem was solved.

The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable because it would only create more problems. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. How stupid can you get?

While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident. Moving the waste does not solve the problem, it INCREASES the problem!

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this stupid proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the stupid narrow interests of the corrupt and fascist nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over. We should nationalize ALL of the corrupt and fascist nuclear energy corporations and shut these ticking time bombs down NOW, before it's too late.

Sincerely,

William Davis

129 Wittenberg Road

NY

Bearsville, NY 12409

From: beate dietrich <beated1960@comcast.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

beate dietrich

colorado springs, CO 80907

From: Bozena Grossman <bozenag51@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bozena Grossman

211East 7th Street

Brooklyn, NY 11218

From: Doris Munger <dlmunger@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Doris Munger

56 Horton Lane

New Canaan, CT 06840

From: Liz Helenchild <deejayliz@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Liz Helenchild

Box 1276

Mendocino, CA 95460

From: Ruth Butler <blueetre@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ruth Butler

1872 s 200 e

slc, UT 84115

From: John Keiser <jlck@nyc.rr.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John Keiser

410 East 6 St., Apt. 17B

New York, NY 10009

From: Kim Floyd <kimffloyd@fastmail.fm>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Say no to Radwaste discussion draft

This makes no sense. We do not want to concentrate the storage of radioactive waste in some remote location to be ignored until something really bad happens. We need the nuclear industry to be held responsible for this waste and to be responsible to find permanent long term waste storage.

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kim Floyd

5375 Shirley J. Lane

P. O. Box 422

Wrightwood, CA 92397

From: John Cruickshank <jcruickshank4@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John Cruickshank

324 Parkway St.

Charlottesville, VA 22902

From: Robert Clark <bclark@iserv.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Robert Clark

1153 W Glenlord Rd Lot 68

1153 W Glenlord Rd Lot 68

Saint Joseph, MI 49085

From: Catherine Loudis <CRLoudis@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Catherine Loudis

219 Butterfield Rd

219 Butterfield Rd

SanAnselmo, CA 94960

From: Joanne Williams <joanne29206@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joanne Williams

6436 Sylvan Drive

6436 Sylvan Drive

Columbia, SC 29206

From: Elisabeth Bechmann <elisabeth.bechmann@kstp.at>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Elisabeth Bechmann

Neugebäudeplatz

Neugebäudeplatz

St. Pölten, ot 03100

From: Denise Green <dgreen@presidio-isd.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Denise Green

PO Box 904

PO Box 904

Presidio, TX 79845

From: James Odling <odlingj@pipeline.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

James Odling

5170

O'Sullivan Dr

Los Angeles, CA 90032

From: jeri fioramanti <dancingcr0w@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

jeri fioramanti

822 3rd. street

green bay, WI 54304

From: Sandy McComb <sandy0110@frontier.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sandy McComb

04933 Cecilia Dr. Apt. 501

South Haven, MI 49090

From: Stephen Battis <sbattis@tmlp.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Stephen Battis

Middleboro, MA 02346

From: Karen Martellaro <kar4earth@kc.rr.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Karen Martellaro

8210 Caenen Lake Rd.

8210 Caenen Lake Rd.

Lenexa, KS 66215

From: Dolores Pieper <dolorespie@embarqmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dolores Pieper

486 Galahad Drive

486 Galahad Dr.

Franklin, IN 46131

From: deb crippen <tributaries7@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

deb crippen

C R 103

florece, CO 81226

From: Andrea Chavez <achavez86@clear.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Andrea Chavez

6807 Neston

San Antonio, TX 78063

From: Mary R. Wolfe <omwolfmar@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mary R. Wolfe

2 Oakridge Court

Lutherville, MD 21093

From: E. C. Roy <staroyo@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

E. C. Roy

450 E. Mills Ave - #19

Breaux Bridge, Louisiana, LA 70517

From: Kimberly Potter <potter.kimberly1@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Potter

8905 Langwood Drive

104

Raleigh, NC 27613

From: Stuart Mork <morkabu@aim.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Stuart Mork

7710 31st Ave NW

Seattle, WA 98117

From: Jan Boudart <j-boudart@northwestern.edu>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

I am Jan Boudart. I am strongly in favor of the following message which is created by THE NUCLEAR INFORMATION AND RESOURCE SERVICE. Please consider this as my position.

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jan Boudart

1132 W. Lunt Ave.

Chicago, IL 60626

From: Jan Boudart <j-boudart@northwestern.edu>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Nuclear waste will have to be stored on sight in possibly vitrified form. However there is no really acceptable solution to the problem of nuclear waste.

1. transporting it to a central storage facility:

Radiating people along the route and the workers who must deal with it is unacceptable. (The threat to Las Vegas before Yucca Mountain was dumped (pun) was extraordinary. Nevada was taking a gamble on an accident that it couldn't win.)

2. The French transport of waste to Siberia (and back) is appalling. Then to have it stored in open air as UF6 surpasses any toxicity I am even able to imagine. Someday the area may be -- climate wise -- inhabitable, but it will take more than forever for the radiation and the toxic chemicals to be gone.

3. Dumping nuclear waste in the Channel made France a terrible neighbor to England. Now we want the U.S. States to be pitted against one another to decide who will take the others' waste. I don't want my living room to be used as somebody else's toilet.

4. We must stop creating nuclear waste. Deal with what we have as best we can and realize that the trade-offs for power will always be excruciating. However, we have to keep them within acceptable limits.

Jan Boudart

1132 W. Lunt Ave.

Chicago, IL 60626

From: Douglas Mason <dmm551@psu.edu>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Douglas Mason

120 E. Beaver Ave.,

Apt. 310

State College, PA 16801

From: Emily Ford <teakford2@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Emily Ford

345 West 70th Street

New York, NY 10023

From: Lloyd Hedger <lloydmhedger@msn.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lloyd Hedger

224 N G St. #405

-

Tacoma, WA 98403

From: Grace Adams <graceadams830@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Please dump the whole problem in the lap of US Navy. They have the world's best record on nuclear power safety. Being military, they can certainly cope with terrorists. If they believe they can make good use of spent nuclear power plant fuel rods, they most likely are right. It would take 3,000 years of just letting those nuclear fuel rods sit around in dry casks for the radioactivity level to decline to that of the ore from which they were made. That is as far into the future as the reign of King David of ancient Israel was in the past. I doubt the United States will still be a nation by then. I trust US Navy to do the right thing better than I trust any corporation, beholden only to its own stockholders.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Grace Adams

406 Valley St 3

none

Willimantic, CT 06226

From: Steven Handwerker <drstevenehandwerker@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Steven Handwerker

6465 Via Benita

6465 Via Benita

Boca Raton, FL 33488

From: Gayle Barrett <bcnu_intuscany@bellsouth.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gayle Barrett

N.W. 43rd Avenue

nw 43 ave

Pompano, FL 33066

From: Joni Solis <AnimalNewsInfo@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joni Solis

644 Jaeger Road

Kentwood, LA 70444

From: Greg Gentry <gsgentry@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Greg Gentry

2434 Frays Mill Rd

Ruckersville, VA 22968

From: Mike McCormick <talkingsticktv@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mike McCormick

1414 NE 70th

Seattle, WA 98115

From: Phyllis Arist <lesmotsdujour@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Arist

945 Ridge

Evanston, IL 60202

From: Molly Madden <madden_molly@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Molly Madden

6328 Indiana

6328 Indiana

K.C., MO 64132

From: Jennifer Salhus <jsalhus@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Salhus

6 Naugatuck

Norfolk, MA 02056

From: Sandra M Zwingelberg <ychild99@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sandra M Zwingelberg

782 S Lincoln St

782 S Lincoln St

Denver, CO 80209

From: linda kirtz <lindakirtz@juno.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

linda kirtz

Orcas, WA 98280

From: Alan Muller <greendel@dca.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Alan Muller

Box 69

Port Penn, DE 55066

From: Melissa Epple <santafemom@earthlink.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Melissa Epple

20 Village Ln.

Santa Fe, NM 87505

From: Pamela VourosCallahan <pamelazoe@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Pamela VourosCallahan

11761 Adams Road

11761 Adams Road

Granger, IN 46530

From: jean hoegler <jhoegler@wheatonalumni.org>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident. No "mobile Chernobyl", now or ever, anywhere.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over. Please.

Sincerely,

jean hoegler

319 School St.

Villa Park, IL 60181

From: Amy Gustin <amyacorner@yaho.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Amy Gustin

P.O. Box 2301

Redway, CA 95560

From: Donna Varner-Sheaves <FairQueen1@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Donna Varner-Sheaves

229 Haywicke Pl

229 Haywicke Pl

Wake Forest, NC 27587

From: Joel Kay <jjkof1@msn.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joel Kay

10707 SE Stanley Ave

none

Milwaukie, OR 97222

From: Sister Mary Schmuck RSM <schmuckrsm@scnazarethky.org>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority.

The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly.

While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sister Mary Schmuck RSM

P O Box 3000

P O Box 3000

Nazareth, KY 40048

From: anne behroozi <anne_behroozi@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

anne behroozi

1166 Nevada ave

san jose, CA 95125

From: Kim Atkinson <kim@pulsewave.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kim Atkinson

PO Box 703

Sebastopol, CA 95473

From: Axel Vogt <vogt@ub.uni-freiburg.de>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways -- even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome -- yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry -- which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Axel Vogt

Reinhold-Schneider-Str. 15

Freiburg, ot 79117

From: JAMES CONROY <JIM214COMRAD@GMAIL.COM>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

JAMES CONROY

214 NINTH STREET

NINTH STREET

HICKSVILLE, NY 11801

From: Shirley Cupani <scupani@msn.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Shirley Cupani

10434 E McLellan Rd

10434 E. McLellan Rd.

Mesa, AZ 85207

From: Myra Remily <mremily@presentationsisters.org>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Myra Remily

1500 nth 2nd. st

1500nth.2nd.St.

Aberdeen, SD 57401

From: Joy Perry <jperry4736@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joy Perry

7046 Fairdale Ave.

Dallas, TX 75227

From: Carolyn Poinelli <gingkolady@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Poinelli

36 Prince St #12

Boston, MA 02113

From: Barbara Bakie <babsbakie@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Barbara Bakie

211 N. 36th St.

Nixa, MO 65714

From: Margaret Wright <mzwright@att.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Margaret Wright

162 Brevoort Rd

162 Brevoort Rd., Columbus 43214

Columbus, OH 43214

From: Lynne Teplin <lynnet@lagcc.cuny.edu>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lynne Teplin

830 Palmer Road #3B

Bronxville, NY 10708

From: peter sipp <peterfoxsipp@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

peter sipp

212 Short Michigan

Asheville, NC 28806

From: Elizabeth S <elizabeth1961@care2.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth S

Ontario

Ontario

Ontario, ON 000000

From: Millard Martin <harpstring@CenturyTel.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Millard Martin

37194 Bay Street NE

Hansville, WA 98340

From: Lisa Pelletier <lrp13@humboldt.edu>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lisa Pelletier

P.O. Box 762

Arcata, CA 95521

From: Alex Snyderman <alexsnymdman@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 3:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Alex Snyderman

24545 Town Center Drive

Unit 5309

Valencia, CA 91355

From: Claire Mortimer <clairebearcfm@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Claire Mortimer

PO Box 184

57

Brooklin, ME 04616

From: Kellie Smith <kelf.nh@live.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kellie Smith

13 Brandy Lane

Deering, NH 03244

From: Lynne Preston <bluelynne@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lynne Preston

638 Rhode Island St.

San Francisco, CA 94107

From: Jeff Salvaryn <musicnut21@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jeff Salvaryn

1528 Herrin St.

Redondo Beach, CA 90278

From: Tim Milam <broncstim@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Tim Milam

1010 Country Club Drive

Mission, TX 78572

From: Jennifer Savage <jensav55@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Savage

36 E. 69th St.

New York, NY 10021

From: Patricia Constantino <patrianyc@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patricia Constantino

40 Third Street

Brooklyn, NY 11231

From: Lucy Howard <lhoward_21034@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lucy Howard

2400 Castleton Rd

Darlington, MD 21034

From: Patricia Jessup <patsy.j@telkomsa.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patricia Jessup

33 Derby Rd.,Kenilworth

33 Derby Rd.,Kenilworth

Cape Town ., ot 7708

From: Madeline Aron <madelinearon@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Madeline Aron

1006 Richmond NE

1006 Richmond NE

Albuquerque, NM 87106

From: Diane Whitmire <dragondw@sonic.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Our Country is at a perilous juncture in the road. It is time to stop pandering to the various industries, and do the real job and responsibility of a Senate Committee. It should NOT be a Senate Energy Committee, but a Senate INVESTIGATING Committee!

Begin with the basic facts starting with the most critical in first place: There is NO cure for Radiation Poisoning. Radioactive Waste has no Expiration Date for Shelf Life!!! Nuclear and Breeder Reactors have meltdowns BECAUSE Nuclear properties are ALWAYS Hot!

Follow those simple truths with the old and on-going problem which has specifically to do with the "shelf life" and Radioactivity of anything Nuclear. It, like everything manmade, creates a waste product. This waste product is STILL HOT and Will Be for something like 500-1,000 years! No one knows!

The utility companies and the Federal Gov't and its Agencies, such as the DOE, have literally TONS of Radioactive Waste to dispose of. There is NO such thing as Safe Disposal of Radioactive Waste. It's always radioactive. You've created a monster. It's a "live" monster as a Reactor which is vulnerable to meltdowns thereby irradiating every living thing virtually everywhere due to wind drifts. That's just the Reactors.

We not only have tons of our OWN radioactive waste we've no idea how to get rid of, but the U.S. has agreed to take Canada's? Ship it down through the States? Then what? There is NO KNOWN Containment for Radioactive Waste. It always erodes the container from the inside because....it's HOT! It will ALWAYS DO THIS!

The DOE with the approval of the President has come up with "a" solution: Recycle both the liquid Radioactive waste by dumping it in our waters and recycle the solid Radioactive Waste by putting it in zippers, belt buckles, pet dishes, and other household products.

What are you all about? What are you thinking? Is anyone connecting the dots? What ever gave any of you the idea that you had the RIGHT to actually recycle Radioactive Waste on the American People?

It's time to lose the Good ol' boy network because you have all forgotten the purpose of your positions in Washington which is simply this:

You are to Represent the American People! That's it.

Fulfill your responsibility and defeat this Insanity!

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Diane Whitmire

Santa Rosa, CA 95404

From: Judith Janes <fabricwoman@msn.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Judith Janes

Spokane Valley, WA 99206

From: Steve Patton <VietVet.Surfer@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Steve Patton

1595 Linda Mar Blvd.

Pacifica, CA 94044

From: Barbara Curtis <barb647@verizon.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Barbara Curtis

647-A Nutley Drive

Monroe Twp, NJ 08831

From: Abe Levy <abe@slought.org>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Abe Levy

4875 Pelican Colony Boulevard #301

Bonita Springs, FL 34134

From: William Hofford <aradius@spiritone.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

William Hofford

4300 Sideburn Rd

Fairfax, VA 22030

From: Dana Ginn <DGinn92591@cs.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dana Ginn

31463 Britton Circle

Temecula, CA 92591

From: Adrienne Davis <davis.adrienne@icloud.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Adrienne Davis

1437 Hillcrest Road

Santa Barbara, CA 93103

From: Christopher Camera <cwc0000@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Christopher Camera

2256 Nottingham Road

Upper Arlington, OH 43221

From: Rose Marie Cecchini, MM <officelpjcs@catholiccharitiesgallup.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rose Marie Cecchini, MM

503 West Highway 66

Gallup, NM 87301

From: JIM HEAD <JIMHEADJR@HOTMAIL.COM>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

JIM HEAD

15307 NORTHGATE

APT#102

OAK PARK, MI 48237

From: C. P. Evelyn <bcharmz@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

C. P. Evelyn

520 S Mariposa ave

Los Angeles, CA 90020

From: Robert O'Brien <robrien2000@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Robert O'Brien

972 Allamanda DR.

Delray Beach, FL 33483

From: John Daly <jackd@logancenter.org>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John Daly

PO Box 696

217 West Michigan Street

New Carlisle, IN 46552

From: sue colucci <sucolucci@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

sue colucci

7155 Hillside

Clarkston, MN 48346

From: Richard Ellison <climbwall@msn.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste transportation is not safe!

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Richard Ellison

8003 28th NE

Seattle, WA 98115

From: David Schrom <david@ecomagic.org>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Schrom

381 Oxford Avenue

Palo Alto, CA 94306

From: Jeffery Garcia <jeffery@mcn.org>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jeffery Garcia

PO Box 1166

Mendocino, CA 95460

From: cathy wells <wellscj@vmi.edu>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

cathy wells

93 broad wing trl

lexington, VA 24450

From: judith bean <jellybeano@att.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Judith Bean

1727 Woodhaven Way

Oakland, CA 94611

From: Mary McMahon <marymcmahon@greynun.org>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mary McMahon

1750 Quarry Rd.

1750 Quarry Rd.

Yardley, PA 19067

From: LuAnna McNett <fairefarmtokitchen@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

LuAnna McNett

Eastsound, WA 98245

From: frank depinto <fdepinto@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

frank depinto

box 6194

chattanooga, TN 37401

From: diane crummett <dyanalake@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Rad waste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

diane crummett

12 dogwood, p.o. box 1047

p.o. box 1047

soap lake, WA 98851

From: Allison Ostrer <aostrer@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Allison Ostrer

1107 E Denny Way, #C-3

2

Seattle, WA 98122

From: arlene dreste <apdreste@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

arlene dreste

2461 rosser rd

2461 rosser rd

ajo, AZ 85321

From: Polly Meadows <polmea@msn.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Polly Meadows

1068 Shallcross Lake Road

Middletown, DE 19709

From: Kathryn Lemoine <truth58@bayou.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Lemoine

106 Parkwest Drive

Bldg. 3-C

West Monroe, LA 71291

From: Thomas V. Connor <TConnor@hvc.rr.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Thomas V. Connor

17 Dubois Street

17 Dubois Street

Wallkill, NY 12589

From: Tamadhur Al-Aqeel <tamadhur@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Tamadhur Al-Aqeel

1816 S. Bedford St.

Los Angeles, CA 90035

From: Geraldine May <huerhuero@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Geraldine May

PO Box 153

9845 Huerhuero Rd.

Santa Margarita, CA 93432

From: Deanna Nakosteen <deanna@west.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Deanna Nakosteen

10239 Ojai-Santa Paula Road

Ojai, CA 93023

From: Pearl Goldman <wexford158@msn.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Pearl Goldman

11460 NW 5th St

Plantation, FL 33325

From: Sharon Root <sharonroot@co.lyon.mn.us>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sharon Root

504 Fairgrounds Rd

Marshall, MN 56258

From: cassandra church <sparrowcat2@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

cassandra church

1853 county rd.

1853 country rd.

e. montpelier, VT 05601

From: Steven Shore <wildginseng50@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Steven Shore

7 kingwood court

7 kingwood court

Muttontown, NY 11791

From: Thomas Blanton <tebmtn@embarqmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Thomas Blanton

2228 Russell Drive

Granite Falls, NC 28630

From: Renee Nelson <Idealfellow99@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Renee Nelson

370 Acacia Avenue

Bakersfield, CA 93306

From: Ronald Lockwood <anteater11@verizon.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ronald Lockwood

7110 Bensville Road

White Plains, MD 20695

From: Rob Kulakofsky <lapidary_rob@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rob Kulakofsky

1520 S. Desert Crest Dr.

Tucson, AZ 85713

From: Shawn Boucher <shawnr1976@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Shawn Boucher

Columbia, SC 29203

From: dave falcon <entrepreneur1@hotmail.co.uk>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

dave falcon

26 windsor terr

penicuik, NY 12345

From: Cindi Darling <darling339@earthlink.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Cindi Darling

339 Forrest Avenue

Fairfax, CA 94930

From: Irene Radke <irenelillian@juno.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Irene Radke

4648 SW 38th Terr

Dania Beach, FL 33312

From: Marilyn Kaggen <mkaggen@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Kaggen

1910 Foster

Brooklyn, NY 11230

From: Maureen Gettle <LORETTAIII@AOL.COM>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Maureen Gettle

225 Village Cove

225 Village Cove, Mt. Gretna, PA

Mt. Gretna, PA 17064

From: Carol Held <clheld@tds.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carol Held

3804 Bunker Hill

Middleton, WI 53562

From: Alan Lawrence <amethystpurple1@msn.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Alan Lawrence

6901 N. Haight Ave.

Portland, OR 97217

From: Joseph Wasserman <joewass64@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joseph Wasserman

87 Shadow Lane

87 Shadow Lane

West Hartford, CT 06110

From: Joy Sullivan <lightjoy@ptd.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joy Sullivan

16 Linmor Ave

16 linmor Ave

Newton, NJ 07860

From: Linda Azzi <linda@corsazzi.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Linda Azzi

9850 Zenith Meridian Drive #12-203

Englewood, CO 80112

From: Marshall Sanders <sandyssanders@att.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marshall Sanders

2200 Adeline St., #250A

250a

Oakland, CA 94607

From: Michael Gilbert <mykolas1601@msn.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michael Gilbert

8 Morris Rd

8 Morris Rd

Bethpage, NY 11714

From: Carolyn Bame <harplady2@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Bame

3335 North Manor Rd.

Flagstaff, AZ 86004

From: Gabrielle Swanberg <g_swanberg@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gabrielle Swanberg

1649 Lancaster Dr

1649 Lancaster Dr

p, CA 94954

From: Beth PIROLI <tullytown15@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Beth PIROLI

365 Main Street

365 MAIN STREET

Tullytown, PA 19007

From: David Van Deusen <nitehowl@earthlink.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Van Deusen

46 Zabel Hill Road

Feura Bush, NY 12067

From: Linda Brodman <redwdrn@pacbell.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Linda Brodman

Santa Cruz, CA 95062

From: Carolyn Cadigan <carolyncadigan@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Cadigan

1940 Harlem Blvd.

Rockford, IL 61103

From: Denise Caruana <denise.caruana95@live.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Denise Caruana

Triq il-Batterija

B'Bugia, HI BBG1121

From: Dorothy Louis <dorothylouis@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Louis

33125 White Oak Rd., Corvallis, OR

33125 White Oak Rd. Corvallis, OR 97333-2444

Corvallis, OR 97333

From: William Palmisano <palm1953@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

William Palmisano

1578 Las Canoas Rd.

1578 Las Canoas Rd.

Santa Barbara, CA 93105

From: sidney ramsden scott <sramsdenscott@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

sidney ramsden scott

p.o.box 3963

carmel, CA 93921

From: Elke Brandes <elke@antiatomfreiburg.de>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. The waste has to be moved from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site immediately. The production of nuclear waste must be stopped before the negotiation of a permanent repository becomes legitimate. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Elke Brandes

Elke Brandes

134 Scott Blvd

Decatur, GA 30030

From: Patrick Dreier <patrick.dreier@gmx.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patrick Dreier

Industrie 10

Industrie 10, ot 2114

From: Dee Halzack <dee.halz@ix.netcom.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dee Halzack

318 Pawtucket St

318 Pawtucket St

Lowell, MA 01854

From: Pamela Nesbit <panesbit@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Pamela Nesbit

117 Ponozzo Rd

Iron River, MI 49935

From: Patricia Sowards <trishandjorge@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patricia Sowards

10410 93rd St SW

TAcoma, WA 98498

From: Esther Zamora <ezjamoca@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Esther Zamora

12456 Los Moras Way

Victorville, CA 92392

From: LISA BASS <lisajbass@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

LISA BASS

po box 940083

houston, AK 99694

From: James Freeberg <jfreeberg0@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

James Freeberg

POB 938

POB 938

Ashland, OR 97520

From: melvin Taylor <melvin-taylor@usa.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

melvin Taylor

6585 Calvine Road

6585 Calvine Road

Sacramento, CA 95823

From: frank downey <zakk69@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

frank downey

800 covan ave

mobile, AL 36612

From: alina dollat <alina.dollat@laposte.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

alina dollat

5 rue du marais

60270 gouvieux france

gouvieux france, ot 60270

From: alina dollat <alina.dollat@laposte.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

alina dollat

5 rue du marais

60270 gouvieux france

gouvieux france, ot 60270

From: marilyn field <mfield1@san.rr.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

marilyn field

1101 1st Street

Apt. 208

Coronado, CA 92118

From: Nancy Wang <nancy@ethnohtec.org>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nancy Wang

San Francisco

San Francisco, CA 94110

From: Jim Brown <brownjc0@frontiernet.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jim Brown

581 Main St PO Box 193

Cedarville, CA 96104

From: Johanna Cummings <jhcummings@frontiernet.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Johanna Cummings

88 Hickory Street

Rochester, NY 14620

From: Rebecca Ramsay <rebecca.ramsay2@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

During your deliberations on what to recommend for the disposal of nuclear waste materials, I hope you will want to consider comments made at the Blue Ribbon Commission Regional Meeting held in Boston on October 12, 2011.

You may now be hearing from some of the people who attended that meeting and the other regional meetings. My statement is included in the report available at <http://brc.gov>, under "Meetings," then "Regional Public Meetings" where you can read the Presentations (mine is the third from the end of the list.)

Having read the January 2012 Blue Ribbon Commission Report to the Secretary of Energy, I see that none of my comments were incorporated into Section 2.3.1 on Ethical Responsibility. It would be nice to think that public input can be given greater consideration in your recommendations.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Ramsay

Five Exeter park

Five Exeter Park, Cambridge, MA 02140-2215

Cambridge, MA 02140

From: Davis & Rhonda Costas-Mirza <davismirza@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Canadians Urge: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

As concerned Canadians, we thank you the US Senate for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

We ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Davis & Rhonda Costas-Mirza

29 Hamilton

29 Hamilton St.

Toronto, CANADA, NY 14301

From: jim phillips <jdphillips@ureach.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

jim phillips

po 2381

stone rd

los banos, CA 93635

From: James Love <alohaland@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

James Love

P.O. Box 1838

P.O. Box 1838 Honoka'a, HI

Honoka'a, HI 96727

From: A M Frank <crabcakegranny@msn.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Rad waste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

A M Frank

P O Box 2173

18825 94th Ave W, Edmonds, WA 98020

Forney, TX 98296

From: Ran Zirasri <hawkins_j_m@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ran Zirasri

301 11th Ave. NW

Mandan, ND 58554

From: Linda Griggs <griggsquaker@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for examining the essential area of the radioactive waste problem. It should be an extremely high priority! The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only aggravate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site.

Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Linda Griggs

147 Mosley Drive, Apt 2

none

Syracuse, NY 13206

From: Claudia Van Gerven <claudia.vangerven@colorado.edu>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Claudia Van Gerven

727 Ithaca Dr.

Boulder, CO 80305

From: Ken Segal <knsegal@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ken Segal

58 Hilltop Acres

Yonkers, NY 10704

From: Rachel Gottman <rgottman@emich.edu>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rachel Gottman

Bemis Rd.

Ypsilanti, MI 48197

From: Dave Brast <dbrast@svn.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dave Brast

P.O. Box 484

Inverness, CA 94937

From: R Peterson <petersonjrm@ymail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

R Peterson

Island

Charleston, SC 29407

From: L.J. Adams <lou4261@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Keep our Highways/citizens safe: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

The Senate Energy Comm. proposal will create/foster more problems than it solves. However, thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be the highest priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken.

However, moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

L.J. Adams

po Box 6196

2341 Arb. Hills Dr.

Jackson, MI 49204

From: Nicholas Merry <nmerry1@binghamton.edu>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Merry

Johnson City, NY 13790

From: Janka Gera <gera.janka@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Janka Gera

1. Dankó

Szatymaz, ot 6763

From: Carol Maghakian <carol.maghakian@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carol Maghakian

6457 Sweet Gum Trail

6

Myrtle Beach, SC 29588

From: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 11:23 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: RE: feedback on the Nuclear Waste Act of 2013

Apologies! Please find the template at: <http://www.energy.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/nuclear-waste-bill-feedback>

From: Kara Colton [mailto:Kara.Colton@energyca.org]

Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 10:52 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: RE: feedback on the Nuclear Waste Act of 2013

Dear Sir or Madam,

Is there a chance you can resend me the template for submitting comments? I am afraid they did not make it through with your message re: feedback.

Much appreciated,

Kara Colton

Kara Colton

Director of Nuclear Energy Programs

Energy Communities Alliance

1101 Connecticut Ave, NW

Washington, D.C. 20036

Office: (202) 828-2439

Cell: (703) 864-3520

kara.colton@energyca.org

<http://www.energyca.org/>

From: feedback, n waste (Energy) [mailto:nwaste_feedback@energy.senate.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 10:42 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: feedback on the Nuclear Waste Act of 2013

Dear Colleagues,

On April 25, 2013, Senators Wyden, Alexander, Feinstein, and Murkowski released a draft bill <<http://www.energy.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2013/4/senators-release-discussion-draft-of-comprehensive-nuclear-waste-legislation>> to create a sustainable, participatory process for managing nuclear waste. By now we hope you have heard that the senators are seeking comments and suggestions on the draft bill, as well as on the alternative language for siting an interim storage facility proposed by Senators Alexander and Feinstein. In addition, the senators have posed eight questions on which they request comments.

Please view this email as thanks for already having taken time to discuss your perspectives on the bill with the Senators and staff. We hope you will also provide your comments in a formal manner through this submission email and the website as suggested below. Please direct any questions about the process to nwaste_feedback@energy.senate.gov; we look forward to hearing from you.

Directions for Submissions

Please submit comments electronically to: Nwaste_feedback@energy.senate.gov

Submission due date: Friday, May 24, 2013 at 5:00pm (EST)

The documents attached below can be used as a template for submitting comments. We request that you submit your comments in the template format, but will accept comments in other formats. Please feel free to respond to as many or as few of the questions as you like.

Please provide your name and affiliation in the header of your comments.

The committee may post the comments, including any personal identifying information you provide (street or e-mail addresses, or phone numbers) it receives on its website. If you would like your personal identifying information withheld, please indicate that.

The comment period will close on Friday, May 24, 2013.

Please find the submission documents below and the link to the discussion draft, summaries and questions here <<http://www.energy.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2013/4/senators-release-discussion-draft-of-comprehensive-nuclear-waste-legislation>> .

From: Aleita Hass-Holcombe <aleita@cmug.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 11:19 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Aleita Hass-Holcombe

2022 NW Myrtlewood Way

2022 NW Myrtlewood Way

Corvallis, OR 97330

From: M. Sims <menucha65@verizon.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 10:28 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Mobile Chernobyl Bill from Senators Wyden, Murkowski, Feinstein, and Alexander

I oppose parking lot dumps for high-level radioactive waste, and the risky irradiated nuclear fuel shipments they would launch onto our roads, rails, and waterways. This would be not only a serious nuclear weapons proliferation risk <<http://www.beyondnuclear.org/storage/Reprocessingwebview.pdf>> , but also a risk of widespread radioactive contamination of the environment downwind and downstream. It would also cost taxpayers and/or ratepayers many tens of billions of dollars.

Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) <http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/HOSS_PRINCIPLES_3-23-10x.pdf> makes a lot more sense than this bad bill. HOSS calls for emptying vulnerable high-level radioactive waste storage pools into on-site dry cask storage, but would require significant upgrades to the safety, security, and environmental protections associated with dry cask storage: safeguards against accidents <<http://www.nirs.org/radwaste/atreactorstorage/drycaskfactsheet07152004.pdf>> and natural disasters; concealment, distancing between casks, and fortification against attacks; and quality assurance on cask design and fabrication <<http://www.nirs.org/radwaste/atreactorstorage/shiranielleg04.htm>> to ensure they will last not decades <<http://www.beyondnuclear.org/radioactive-waste-whatsnew/2013/4/28/agency-warns-high-level-nuke-waste-casks-deteriorating-alrea.html>> , but centuries, without leaking radioactivity into the environment. Nearly 200 environmental groups, representing all 50 states, have endorsed HOSS. <http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/HOSS_PRINCIPLES_3-23-10x.pdf> They've been calling for it for well over a decade now.

A strong linkage between "consolidated interim storage" and permanent disposal should be re-established in this proposed legislation. The risk of de facto permanent parking lot dumps for high-level radioactive waste is unacceptable! Rushing into Mobile Chernobyl shipments, and playing a radioactive waste shell game on the roads, rails, and waterways, makes no sense and takes unnecessary risks. Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) should be required instead, as a common sense interim alternative to this bill's bad ideas.

Ms. M. Sims, Montclair NJ 07042

From: Danielle Crouch <dcrouch12@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 10:21 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Please do NOT allow toxic nuclear waste to be moved to interim storage sites, especially not without first requiring the decision of a safer, permanent site. Allowing interim storage sites will simply mean that dangerous nuclear waste will be moved more often, and without an identified permanent site in mind the interim site will simply become a de facto permanent site. Moving nuclear waste is dangerous, and it should be done with as much caution, and as infrequently, as possible. Carting these toxins around without a long-term plan is foolish, and will not be tolerated.

Danielle Crouch

Brattleboro, VT 05301

From: Jim Stewart <jim@earthdayla.org>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 9:50 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:We need safe disposal of Radwaste, your discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jim Stewart

1216 S. Westlake Ave.

Los Angeles, CA 90006

From: Joan Makurat <joan@bmsi.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 9:26 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joan Makurat

10816 Verde Vista Dr

Fairfax, VA 22030

From: kathleenroper <kroper49@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 9:18 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: barge shipments

Hello,

Please vote not to allow barge shipments on Lake Michigan. One accident is all we would need to destroy our lake.

It's just too risky.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Kathy Roper

2932 Peach Creek Court

Fennville, MI 49408

616-610-0669 From: thomas coulson <tomcoulson@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:56 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

As long as there is no capacity to neutralize these toxic fuel rods, our nation should move to stop producing them and leave those already produced where they are. Technology is moving ahead at a rate that would allow the plans for additional nuclear power plants to be abandoned, if the sudden and drastic change in the cost of natural gas doesn't automatically do so.

Meanwhile, simply moving the problem of nuclear waste around the nation does nothing but make room for the production and storage of more such waste at the existing plants.

thomas coulson

1001 reemes cove rd.

Marshall, NC 28753

From: Shoshannah Benmosché <biophilial@verizon.net>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:23 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: hlr-waste discussion draft

Thanks for accepting public comment on your draft.

I do not see how the issues surrounding multiple relocations for interim storage of hlr-waste have changed since last visited and found unacceptable by both Congress and Executive Branches of our government.

My understanding is that until such time as geologically stable safe permanent sites are found, it remains from both public safety and taxpayer liability perspectives necessary to deal with hlr-waste at the site of production and with the safest technology currently available. HOSS dry-cask containment for interim storage seems far less vulnerable to identified risks than prolonged interim wet storage.

HOSS is strongly supported by the scientifically informed. Their consensus urges dry-cask containment be required for all cooled hlr-waste in "interim" on-site storage facilities and a requirement for its onetime off-site transportation to a geologically stable "permanent" storage site.

Protecting public health, environmental protections and the interests of current and future taxpayers (rather than the financial interests of the nuclear power industry), should be the effects of your proposed law. Propping up a failed industry at the expense of the public's health and purse is what is served by this dangerous buck-shifting proposal. Which reflects a perverse hierarchy of values. It is corrupt. It is unacceptable!

Knowledgeable opinion holders and public interest advocates agree that appropriately engineered Hardened On-Site Storage units and "interim" storage facilities designed to contain those units for hundreds of years must be built on the sites where the waste is produced until a permanent multi-millenia solution is found.

A permanent solution is urgently needed given the geological precariousness of most of our hlr-waste generating sites being located on fault lines. The fact that no permanent solution is yet known heightens the insanity of continuing to proliferate hlr-waste despite having no affordable way to live with it or safe way of disposing of it.

Why aren't we legislating the decommissioning of nuclear plants? Drafting laws to protect the public from the heightened risks of operating aging nuclear power plants beyond their designed life expectancy and below their original safety specifications?

Counting all the costs nuclear is unprofitable and uninsurable. Let it go! The American taxpayer doesn't need to bailout another failed industry and exempt it from cleaning up its own mess. Please put your law drafting enthusiasm into drafting just laws. Require a permanent solution to a dirty industry. Do not download its liabilities and costs onto the public.

There are cheap, direct, and non-polluting ways to generate hot water and electricity. Stop the production of hlr-waste and start permanently decommissioning nuclear fission hot-water-powered electricity generation plants and start investing in a viable future for our species in the world.

Sincerely,

Shoshannah Benmosché

910 West End Ave. 8D

New York, NY 10025

From: Donald Wallace <donwwallace@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:35 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems. You should instead focus on a solution to eliminate ANY future nuclear waste due to power generation needs: There is a scientifically accepted solution, (Argonne National Laboratory, 1979); (see:<http://www.fusionpowercorporation.com/references/appendices/30-years-of-hif-endorsements>) workable NOW, for the world's energy challenge ... no highly radioactive waste materials, no new CO2 in the atmosphere and locatable on any seashore where the heat of fusion (how the sun works) can be harnessed to cheaply desalinate ocean water creating 3000 acre-feet of potable water per day (3000 acre-feet = 977 554 286 US gallons), (see: <http://www.fusionpowercorporation.com/freshwater2>), as well as an oil field's worth of liquid fuels (500,000 barrels of gasoline, diesel, etc) by pulling carbon out of the atmosphere (ultimately carbon neutral because carbon is put back as we use the fuel)(see: <http://www.fusionpowercorporation.com/liquid-fuel-and-hydrogen2>) and simultaneously generate 10 GW+ of electricity, all using known technologies (except for the fusion containment part). Fusion without laser or Tokamak problems!

RF Accelerator Driven Heavy Ion Fusion (RFADHIF), the elegant solution to abundant energy, clean water and transitional fuel to get humanity to and through the electric car economy has been endorsed by physicists as "the conservative solution" to fusion energy generation. See: (https://4b35dbeb-a-62cb3a1a-s-sites.googlegroups.com/site/fusionpowercorporationv30/documents/Picture%2064.png?attachauth=ANoY7cps12oyRxX8C81v6vPE9lhTyjAPZR8ENo7wcVEGPnNb9cOPh4z5bY3WxLsW1DILVtfpySO5tjfmFtiMewGGk5vm2K3-44siewzjmw5G2FMsxHUxZpAeRt6SubyyCjWfY_wfpHGdlEj2QtIPf07Qfbxg7gWuIZTmX9C_qADcFi0sFTcxV2VZVjDgL4sOV0E9F6oV7emtq9aNIEJLKQILjZ85jpHIPOMFNESslzPbztrm80PvKldP6XAX0tHk-HkH_qOJmBd&attredirects=0) The science and the engineering are well understood (heavy ion particle accelerators, heat exchange systems, steam turbines, desalinization, atmospheric carbon chemistry, etc.) All for about the cost of 7.5 months (@6.7 billion per month) of the "war on terror" to free us from foreign oil, climate change, blackouts, brownouts, gas shortages, nuclear waste storage issues (except for the existing waste), job limiting energy pricing for energy intense industries, no mining will be needed in order to sustain the operation, ...

It will provide:

- An abundant source of 'clean green and very safe' energy;
- Jobs, jobs and more jobs;
- A safe energy system - the safe nuclear energy that everyone wants;
- A source of carbon neutral liquid fuels to maintain the existing transportation system;
- A source of water to coastal communities in parts of the world where water supply is limited (pumpable inland);
- A sunset of the fission and fossil fuel age;
- A cost stabilized source of energy for industry (=jobs);
- A stabilization and potential reversal of carbon in the atmosphere;
- An increase in standards of living for the world;
- An increase in the life of oil, natural gas and coal for industrial products...

Support the building of a RF Accelerator Driven Heavy Ion Fusion (RFADHIF) system to solve the world energy crisis not ITER. RFADHIF can produce 100GW of thermal energy using classical physics ... no research necessary. (92:1)

Fusion power is not a distant hope. It is currently a realizable technology that that can be applied today. It can, and will, solve our energy problem.

See also: 1. A Google talk by FPC President, Charles E. Helsley in Los Angeles

2. The presentations by President, Dr. Charles E. Helsley and Chief Technology Officer and Chairman, Robert J. Burke at the HIF 2010 Symposium in Darmstadt, Germany

3. The talks by Dr. Burke, Dr. Helsley and Dr. A. Burke at the Workshop for Accelerators for Heavy Ion Fusion in May 2010 at Berkeley, California

4. A You Tube Video by Finecut "StarPower for Tomorrow" www.youtube.com/watch?v=7a7f1QGGYiY

5. <http://www.fusionpowercorporation.com/home/summary>

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Donald Wallace

1710 Cold Canyon Rd

1710 Cold Canyon Road

Calabasas, CA 91302

From: Nancy Hiestand <nancya0624@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:18 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nancy Hiestand

526 South Campus Way, Davis

Davis

Davis, CA 95616

From: Michael Worsham <marylandmichael@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 10:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Senate radioactive waste discussion draft is not acceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome, yet this proposed legislation would likely ensure that.

I ask you to please focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michael Worsham

1916 Cosner Road

1916 Cosner Road

Forest Hill, MD 21050

From: David Broadwater <csi@thegrid.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 9:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Broadwater

6604 Portola Road

6604 Portola Road

Atascadero, CA 93422

From: Janice Niehaus <Jan@CommunicationByDesign.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 9:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Discussion draft legislation on radioactive waste must be scrapped

While it is absolutely true that our nation desperately needs a solution the problem of radioactive waste storage, the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation moves us FARTHER from a solution.

Neither the public nor the environment, both of which have been entrusted to for safe-keeping as our elected officials, will benefit from this proposed legislation. In truth, the nuclear power industry would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program.

Be honest: Would you even consider such a fool-hardy without extreme pressure (and perhaps carrots as well) from the nuclear power industry?

This legislation would authorize transporting tens of thousands of casks containing lethal radioactive waste on the roads, railways and waterways of our nation through major cities and across America's agricultural heartland. And you talk about protecting us from terrorists?!?!?

Amazing that you do not consider THIS mobile target a national threat! An average truck-sized would carry the radiological equivalent of 40 Hiroshima bombs. A rail cask would hold 200 Hiroshima bombs worth of radiation.

Now, with reference to the the "interim" solution defined in the draft legislation: If the sites you propose are, in fact, temporary, then we citizens and the only environment we have will be exposed to these mobile risks a second (at least) time, when said radioactive waste travels from the interim to some

yet-to-be-envisioned permanent sites. No one charged with protecting the health, safety and security of the public should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. How about if you just find some permanent sites NOW?

Better yet, let the utilities, which are generating this toxic waste in the first place, solve the problem themselves. I am really tired of industry (consider mountain top removal coal mining, as another example) externalizing the cost of their irresponsible production methods, saddling taxpayers with the burden.

Also, my understanding is that the utilities are liable for this radioactive waste when it's on their property, while we taxpayers become liable when it's moved outside their gates. Why in the world should we accept such a catastrophic responsibility and fiscal burden when our federal budgets are already overly stressed? If we are really committed to reducing federal expenses, then we certainly should not be taking on this additional massive and eternal expense.

My final concern relates to the way in which this discussion draft legislation the delinks the issue of interim storage from progress toward a permanent solution. This delinking is even more profound in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative. Without such a linking provision, it more likely that temporary sit would become de facto permanent nuclear waste dumps. No state or community should accept this.

Solutions: Make the waste-generators bear the financial responsibility of moving this waste from the current fuel pools at their own reactor sites to secure dry casks at the same reactor sites. They must then harden the material in situ to prevent attack or destruction by natural or other disaster. .. while you, our elected problem-solvers, work on finding a permanent solution.

So far I've talked only about how to handle the radioactive waste that has already been generated. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power altogether and replace it with clean energy sources.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over. Instead of bailing out the nuclear energy industry, please hold them accountable.

Most sincerely, your reliable voter,

Janice Niehaus

1602 Bellevue Avenue

1602 Bellevue Avenue

Richmond Heights, MO 63117

From: Jane Auringer Danjin <jane_danjin@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 9:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable.

The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.Thank you.

Jane Auringer Danjin

518 Rawlins St. Apt. 3

Port Huron, MI 48060

From: Phyliss Sladek <sladek7@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 9:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for your efforts to address the radioactive waste problem.

Also, I greatly appreciate your providing a way for citizens to comment on this bill.

Here is an outline of my objections to the draft:

1. There is no reason whatsoever to construct interim storage facilities, and many reasons to refrain from this plan.

A. The interim sites are not really interim - this is extremely misleading. The material will remain in the "interim" sites if no permanent sites are found, and even then, the amount to be transferred is conditional and not guaranteed. Indefinite is equal to forever.

B. Communities will not want so-called temporary sites in their area, any more than they would want permanent sites.

C. This draft bill simply avoids the storage problem. It does not solve it; it is not even a meaningful attempt at a solution.

2. Transporting lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site is 1) expensive; 2) hazardous; 3) risks disasters, which would require even more expense to clean up. 4) The risk is greatly

increased with multiple moves, as are proposed by this draft bill. The entire proposal is extremely disingenuous.

3. Progress on a permanent solution is where you should put your energy.

4. If there is no solution, then the plants need to be closed. It's that simple.

The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

P. Sladek

Phyliss Sladek

PO Box 13888

1185 Anderson lane

Santa Barbara, CA 93111

From: Catherine Miller <trevellor@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 8:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Catherine Miller

201 West 92nd Street #6C

New York, NY 10025

From: Sandra M. Cobb <smcobb@beechmere.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 8:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radioactive Waste

Our roads, railways and waterways are no place for temporary or permanent radioactive waste storage. Any movement of this waste must be to a permanent facility set up to protect all of us from its poisons.

Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) is necessary. Any please don't try to foist waste off on our Native Americans or their property. Thank you for your attention.

Sandra Cobb

3880 Elledale Road

Moreland Hills, OH 44022

From: Mark Hein <markheindr@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 8:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste -- "Interim Storage" Is Unsustainable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority.

The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all -- it is not a solution, and is unsustainable.

While the waste must be moved at some point, current safety technology allows only moving it from the spent fuel pools to dry containers on the reactor site.

Any other movement must be to a permanent location, for permanent isolation. So-called "interim" storage sites would increase the risk of accidents and security problems -- and guarantee increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways.

And the "interim" period for using these sites is unknown. This false fix would only help to delay finding a permanent isolation site -- while the temporary, unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent dump.

No state or community should or would accept such an outcome.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future -- not the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry.

The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources.

As for the waste that already exists, we must pursue Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed efforts to find a safe permanent solution.

Sincerely,

Mark Hein

21500 Colina Dr.

Topanga, CA 90290

From: Patrick Bosold <bosolds@lisco.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 7:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation on Radioactive Waste

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patrick Bosold

202 N. 5th St.

Fairfield, IA 52556

From: Pamela Anne Lowry <aynlowry@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 5:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken. Unfortunately, the fix the Senate Energy Committee is considering -- it's "discussion draft" legislation -- would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site will not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome -- yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

The Committee needs to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future of our country, and not just the narrow interests of a nuclear power industry which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Pamela Anne Lowry

I don't give this out

Berkeley, CA 94704

From: Barbara S. Crow <hiker@hiwaay.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 5:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over. This plan is only "kicking the can down the road". Nuclear power, itself, should be scrapped. There is no absolutely safe nuclear facility; there is no completely safe place to store the waste; it's dangerous in every phase and no one wants the waste to be stored near them. It's also a terrible thing to do to the earth and the ecosystems that support us.

Sincerely,

Barbara S. Crow

7817 Alabama Highway 33

Moulton, AL 35650

From: Deborah Veneziale <deby.veneziale@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 5:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Deborah Veneziale

7 W 41st Ave.

#413

San Mateo, CA 94403

From: Steven Starr <starrst@health.missouri.edu>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 4:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste draft

Dear Senate Energy Committee,

It is a bad idea to ship nuclear waste across US highways and railways, it invites a radiological disaster that could put entire interstates and rail lines out of service indefinitely, not to mention making cities and farmland uninhabitable, and exposing large numbers of people to dangerous ionizing radiation.

You have to admit that there is no way to be sure that an accident or terrorist attack would not occur, that would lead to such a scenario. There is, however, a much simpler and better solution.

That is, to use Hardened On-Site Storage, to safely isolate and store the spent fuel on-site. This would preclude the many dangers and expenses associated with shipment of the waste, while providing a safe and acceptable means to remove the waste from overcrowded spent fuel pools, which also invite terrorist attack.

Sincerely,

Steven Starr

Senior Scientist, Physicians for Social Responsibility

Steven Starr

35 N Cedar Drive W, #103

Columbia, MO 65203

From: Andrea Shipley <andrea_shipley@hotmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 4:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Andrea Shipley

4702 Castlebar Drive

4702 Castlebar Drive

Boise, ID 82435

From: James Mulcare <xsecretsx@cableone.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 4:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

James Mulcare

1110 Benjamin St

Clarkston, WA 99403

From: Sewell, Michael <Michael.Sewell@pgnmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 4:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Duke Energy comments on questions associated with the draft of the Nuclear Waste Administration Act

Attachments: 2013-05 Responses to Questions on Wyden et. al. Discussion Draft final.docx

Attached are Duke Energy's responses to the questions posed by the Senate staff in connection with the Wyden NWA Act discussion draft legislation.

From: Sewell, Michael

Sent: Wednesday, May 08, 2013 2:15 PM

To: 'Nwaste_feedback@energy.senate.gov'

Subject: Duke Energy comments on discussion draft of the Nuclear Waste Administration Act

Attached please find Duke Energy's comments on the draft bill. Do not hesitate to contact us with questions or requests for clarification.

Thank you,

Mike Sewell

Mike Sewell

Duke Energy

202.331.8090

michael.sewell@duke-energy.com

From: stuart phillips <stulips@hotmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 3:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: DON'T launch shipments of high-level radioactive waste onto the roads, rails, and waterways in unprecedented numbers, bound for "consolidated interim storage sites," from which they would have to be removed someday, to permanent dumpsites. Unless, that i

Currently proposed legislation is significantly worse than the bill proposed last September by U.S. Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D-NM), the now-retired former chair of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. Although Bingaman unacceptably "gave away" the first 10,000 tons of irradiated nuclear fuel for "centralized interim storage" as a political compromise (a "pilot" parking lot dump, strongly advocated by Sen. Feinstein, with no strings attached to permanent disposal), his bill would have required linkage between permanent disposal and any further "centralized interim storage." He did this in order to guard against "interim" storage sites -- including one threatened in his own state of New Mexico, at WIPP -- from becoming de facto permanent surface storage, if a geologic repository is never pursued, developed, and operated.

The most likely targets for "consolidated interim storage sites" are at DOE facilities, including the Savannah River Site (SRS) in South Carolina, the Idaho National Lab, and as previously mentioned, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in New Mexico. In fact, SRS hopes to reprocess the irradiated nuclear fuel moved there for "consolidated interim storage." This would be not only a serious nuclear weapons proliferation risk <<http://www.beyondnuclear.org/storage/Reprocessingwebview.pdf>> , but also a risk of widespread radioactive contamination of the environment downwind and downstream. It would also cost taxpayers and/or ratepayers many tens of billions of dollars.

Other likely targets for "consolidated interim storage sites" are Native American reservations, as well as nuclear power plants themselves. Over the course of decades, scores of Native American reservations have been targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps, a shameful history of environmental racism.

<<http://www.nirs.org/radwaste/scullvalley/historynativecommunitiesnuclearwaste06142005.pdf>> And, as but one of numerous such examples, Illinois' three-reactor Dresden nuclear power plant, and immediately adjacent General Electric-Morris reprocessing facility, already "host" around 3,000 tons of irradiated nuclear fuel on a single site. There is a high risk that this bill, if enacted, would increase the pressure to import and "consolidate" yet more waste there, as documented in an Oak Ridge study. <<http://info.ornl.gov/sites/publications/files/Pub37008.pdf>>

Rushing into high-level radioactive waste shipments on the roads, rails, and waterways makes no sense. Risks of Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, and Floating Fukushimas include severe accidents (high-speed crashes; high-temperature, long-duration fires; underwater submersions; etc.) or even intentional attacks. Such shipments to parking lot dumps would merely launch a radioactive waste shell game, as the wastes would have to be moved again someday, this time to permanent disposal sites. Thus, high-level radioactive waste transport risks would be multiplied, for no good reason.

Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) <http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/HOSS_PRINCIPLES_3-23-10x.pdf> makes a lot more sense than this bad bill. HOSS calls for emptying vulnerable high-level radioactive waste storage pools into on-site dry cask storage, but would require significant upgrades to the safety, security, and environmental protections associated with dry cask storage: safeguards against accidents <<http://www.nirs.org/radwaste/atreactorstorage/drycaskfactsheet07152004.pdf>> and natural disasters; concealment, distancing between casks, and fortification against attacks; and quality assurance on cask design and fabrication <<http://www.nirs.org/radwaste//atreactorstorage/shiranialeg04.htm>> to ensure they will last not decades <<http://www.beyondnuclear.org/radioactive-waste-whatsnew/2013/4/28/agency-warns-high-level-nuke-waste-casks-deteriorating-alrea.html>> , but centuries, without leaking radioactivity into the environment. Nearly 200 environmental groups, representing all 50 states, have endorsed HOSS. <http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/HOSS_PRINCIPLES_3-23-10x.pdf> They've been calling for it for well over a decade now.

Strong linkage between "consolidated interim storage" and permanent disposal be re-established in this proposed legislation! Warn them that the risk of de facto permanent parking lot dumps for high-level radioactive waste is unacceptable! Let them know that rushing into Mobile Chernobyl shipments, and playing a radioactive waste shell game on the roads, rails, and waterways, makes no sense and takes unnecessary risks. Urge that Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) be required instead, as a common sense interim alternative to this bill's bad ideas.

stu lips, eugene, or

From: Tom Jackson <scrimm@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 3:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Mobile Chernoble

Just say no! We dont want to take the chance of being irradiated!

Find a way to break it down.

From: Michael Mariotte <nirsnet@nirs.org>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 3:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michael Mariotte

3708 Webster Street

Brentwood, MD 20722

From: Sharon Moss <pichwi@att.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 1:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Mobile Chernobyl Bill

Dear Senator Wyden:

I would like to urge that a strong linkage between "consolidated interim storage" and permanent disposal be re-established in this proposed legislation! The risk of de facto permanent parking lot dumps

for high-level radioactive waste is unacceptable! Rushing into Mobile Chernobyl shipments, and playing a radioactive waste shell game on the roads, rails, and waterways, makes no sense and takes unnecessary risks. It is important that Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) be required instead, as a common sense interim alternative to this bill's bad ideas.

Sincerely,

Sharon Moss

From: Brian O'Connell <brianandkaye@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 1:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Comments on Nuclear Waste Discussion Draft

Attachments: Executive_Summary_BRIAN OCONNELL_PRIVATE CITIZEN.doc; Question1_Brian O'Connell_Private CitizenION-1.doc; Question2_BRIAN_PRIVATE CITIZEN-2.doc; Question3_BRIAN O'CONNELL_PRIVATE CITIZEN.doc; Question4_BRIAN O'CONNELL_PRIVATE CITIZEN.doc; Question5_BRIAN O'CONNELL_PRIVATE CITIZEN_ON-1.doc; Question6_BRIAN O'CONNELL_PRIVATE CITIZEN.doc; Question7_BRIAN O'CONNELL_PRIVATE CITIZEN.doc; Question8_BRIAN O'CONNELL_PRIVATE CITIZEN.doc

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the discussion draft.

Brian O'Connell

Alexandria, VA

From: Kara Colton <Kara.Colton@energyca.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 10:52 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:RE: feedback on the Nuclear Waste Act of 2013

Dear Sir or Madam,

Is there a chance you can resend me the template for submitting comments? I am afraid they did not make it through with your message re: feedback.

Much appreciated,

Kara Colton

Kara Colton

Director of Nuclear Energy Programs

Energy Communities Alliance

1101 Connecticut Ave, NW

Washington, D.C. 20036

Office: (202) 828-2439

Cell: (703) 864-3520

kara.colton@energyca.org

<http://www.energyca.org/>

From: feedback, n waste (Energy) [mailto:nwaste_feedback@energy.senate.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 10:42 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: feedback on the Nuclear Waste Act of 2013

Dear Colleagues,

On April 25, 2013, Senators Wyden, Alexander, Feinstein, and Murkowski released a draft bill <<http://www.energy.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2013/4/senators-release-discussion-draft-of-comprehensive-nuclear-waste-legislation>> to create a sustainable, participatory process for managing nuclear waste. By now we hope you have heard that the senators are seeking comments and suggestions on the draft bill, as well as on the alternative language for siting an interim storage facility proposed by Senators Alexander and Feinstein. In addition, the senators have posed eight questions on which they request comments.

Please view this email as thanks for already having taken time to discuss your perspectives on the bill with the Senators and staff. We hope you will also provide your comments in a formal manner through this submission email and the website as suggested below. Please direct any questions about the process to nwaste_feedback@energy.senate.gov <mailto:nwaste_feedback@energy.senate.gov> ; we look forward to hearing from you.

Directions for Submissions

Please submit comments electronically to: Nwaste_feedback@energy.senate.gov

Submission due date: Friday, May 24, 2013 at 5:00pm (EST)

The documents attached below can be used as a template for submitting comments. We request that you submit your comments in the template format, but will accept comments in other formats. Please feel free to respond to as many or as few of the questions as you like.

Please provide your name and affiliation in the header of your comments.

The committee may post the comments, including any personal identifying information you provide (street or e-mail addresses, or phone numbers) it receives on its website. If you would like your personal identifying information withheld, please indicate that.

The comment period will close on Friday, May 24, 2013.

Please find the submission documents below and the link to the discussion draft, summaries and questions here <<http://www.energy.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2013/4/senators-release-discussion-draft-of-comprehensive-nuclear-waste-legislation>> .

From: Ben Husch <ben.husch@ncsl.org>

Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 10:54 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: RE: feedback on the Nuclear Waste Act of 2013

Thank you for the email. The National Conference of Legislatures (NCSL) does plan on submitting comments on the discussion draft although will likely be submitting them sometime next week.

Ben Husch

Committee Director, Energy, Transportation and Agriculture Committee

National Conference of State Legislatures

444 North Capitol St., NW Suite 515

Washington, DC 20001

202-624-7779

<<http://www.ncsl.org/summit>>

From: feedback, n waste (Energy) [mailto:nwaste_feedback@energy.senate.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 10:42 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: feedback on the Nuclear Waste Act of 2013

Dear Colleagues,

On April 25, 2013, Senators Wyden, Alexander, Feinstein, and Murkowski released a draft bill <<http://www.energy.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2013/4/senators-release-discussion-draft-of-comprehensive-nuclear-waste-legislation>> to create a sustainable, participatory process for managing nuclear waste. By now we hope you have heard that the senators are seeking comments and suggestions on the draft bill, as well as on the alternative language for siting an interim storage facility proposed by Senators Alexander and Feinstein. In addition, the senators have posed eight questions on which they request comments.

Please view this email as thanks for already having taken time to discuss your perspectives on the bill with the Senators and staff. We hope you will also provide your comments in a formal manner through this submission email and the website as suggested below. Please direct any questions about the process to nwaste_feedback@energy.senate.gov; we look forward to hearing from you.

Directions for Submissions

Please submit comments electronically to: Nwaste_feedback@energy.senate.gov

Submission due date: Friday, May 24, 2013 at 5:00pm (EST)

The documents attached below can be used as a template for submitting comments. We request that you submit your comments in the template format, but will accept comments in other formats. Please feel free to respond to as many or as few of the questions as you like.

Please provide your name and affiliation in the header of your comments.

The committee may post the comments, including any personal identifying information you provide (street or e-mail addresses, or phone numbers) it receives on its website. If you would like your personal identifying information withheld, please indicate that.

The comment period will close on Friday, May 24, 2013.

Please find the submission documents below and the link to the discussion draft, summaries and questions here <<http://www.energy.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2013/4/senators-release-discussion-draft-of-comprehensive-nuclear-waste-legislation>> .

From: Hogle, Jessica <j8h1@pge.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 10:48 AM

To: feedback, nwaste (Energy)

Subject:RE: feedback on the Nuclear Waste Act of 2013

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback in meetings and via this process.

I cannot locate the template for comment submissions in the email or website. Would you please re-send the template document?

Thank you,

Jessica

From: feedback, nwaste (Energy) [mailto:nwaste_feedback@energy.senate.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 10:42 AM

To: feedback, nwaste (Energy)

Subject: feedback on the Nuclear Waste Act of 2013

Dear Colleagues,

On April 25, 2013, Senators Wyden, Alexander, Feinstein, and Murkowski released a draft bill <<http://www.energy.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2013/4/senators-release-discussion-draft-of-comprehensive-nuclear-waste-legislation>> to create a sustainable, participatory process for managing nuclear waste. By now we hope you have heard that the senators are seeking comments and suggestions on the draft bill, as well as on the alternative language for siting an interim storage facility proposed by Senators Alexander and Feinstein. In addition, the senators have posed eight questions on which they request comments.

Please view this email as thanks for already having taken time to discuss your perspectives on the bill with the Senators and staff. We hope you will also provide your comments in a formal manner through this submission email and the website as suggested below. Please direct any questions about the process to nwaste_feedback@energy.senate.gov <mailto:nwaste_feedback@energy.senate.gov> ; we look forward to hearing from you.

Directions for Submissions

Please submit comments electronically to: Nwaste_feedback@energy.senate.gov

Submission due date: Friday, May 24, 2013 at 5:00pm (EST)

The documents attached below can be used as a template for submitting comments. We request that you submit your comments in the template format, but will accept comments in other formats. Please feel free to respond to as many or as few of the questions as you like.

Please provide your name and affiliation in the header of your comments.

The committee may post the comments, including any personal identifying information you provide (street or e-mail addresses, or phone numbers) it receives on its website. If you would like your personal identifying information withheld, please indicate that.

The comment period will close on Friday, May 24, 2013.

Please find the submission documents below and the link to the discussion draft, summaries and questions here <<http://www.energy.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2013/4/senators-release-discussion-draft-of-comprehensive-nuclear-waste-legislation>> .

PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.

To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>

From: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 10:42 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: feedback on the Nuclear Waste Act of 2013

Dear Colleagues,

On April 25, 2013, Senators Wyden, Alexander, Feinstein, and Murkowski released a draft bill <<http://www.energy.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2013/4/senators-release-discussion-draft-of-comprehensive-nuclear-waste-legislation>> to create a sustainable, participatory process for managing nuclear waste. By now we hope you have heard that the senators are seeking comments and suggestions on the draft bill, as well as on the alternative language for siting an interim storage facility proposed by Senators Alexander and Feinstein. In addition, the senators have posed eight questions on which they request comments.

Please view this email as thanks for already having taken time to discuss your perspectives on the bill with the Senators and staff. We hope you will also provide your comments in a formal manner through this submission email and the website as suggested below. Please direct any questions about the process to nwaste_feedback@energy.senate.gov; we look forward to hearing from you.

Directions for Submissions

Please submit comments electronically to: Nwaste_feedback@energy.senate.gov

Submission due date: Friday, May 24, 2013 at 5:00pm (EST)

The documents attached below can be used as a template for submitting comments. We request that you submit your comments in the template format, but will accept comments in other formats. Please feel free to respond to as many or as few of the questions as you like.

Please provide your name and affiliation in the header of your comments.

The committee may post the comments, including any personal identifying information you provide (street or e-mail addresses, or phone numbers) it receives on its website. If you would like your personal identifying information withheld, please indicate that.

The comment period will close on Friday, May 24, 2013.

Please find the submission documents below and the link to the discussion draft, summaries and questions here <<http://www.energy.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2013/4/senators-release-discussion-draft-of-comprehensive-nuclear-waste-legislation>> .

From: jo shaw <jo.shaw@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 10, 2013 11:35 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Nuclear Waste Feedback

Attachments: Executive Summary - Jo Shaw - Concerned Citizen.docx

Please DO NOT EXPONENTIALLY INCREASE THE RISK of deadly nuclear waste by transporting it to interim storage sites from which it has to be removed a second time and transported to permanent dumpsites. This is: CATASTROPHE IN THE MAKING 101.

Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) <http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/HOSS_PRINCIPLES_3-23-10x.pdf> makes a lot more sense, but would require significant upgrades to the safety, security, and environmental protections associated with dry cask storage: safeguards against accidents <<http://www.nirs.org/radwaste/atreactorstorage/drycaskfactsheet07152004.pdf>> and natural disasters, concealment, distancing between casks, fortification against attacks, and quality assurance on cask design and fabrication <<http://www.nirs.org/radwaste/atreactorstorage/shiranielleg04.htm>> to ensure they will last not decades <<http://www.beyondnuclear.org/radioactive-waste-whatsnew/2013/4/28/agency-warns-high-level-nuke-waste-casks-deteriorating-alrea.html>> , but centuries without leaking radioactivity into the environment.

Immeasurably dangerous and expensive, nuclear energy submits humans and all other living things to contamination and an unacceptable threat. Making a commitment to secure permanent repositories for nuclear waste is crucial to protecting the health of our lands, waterways, air, economy and future generations.

Going forward, we must engineer a nuclear exit and an end to the production of nuclear waste; all nuclear reactors no matter how "small" will produce deadly waste. No other technology can, in such short time, create such "long-lasting" catastrophes. Radioactive contamination is the price we are paying caused by a nuclear power industry that has been uncontrolled.

Respectfully,

Jo Shaw

From: Helen Hays <hlhays@ccgmail.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 09, 2013 11:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: parking lot dumps for nuclear waste

I oppose parking lot dumps for high-level radioactive waste, and the vulnerable and risky irradiated nuclear fuel shipments they would send out onto our highways, railroads and waterways. These lot dumps would, in effect, be a Mobile Chernobyl.

Thank you for your consideration of this communication.

Helen Hays

hlhays@ccwebster.net

Our lives begin to end when we become silent about things that matter.

From: Karl J Volk <karljvolk@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 09, 2013 10:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: please do the right thing not the political smear job

Submitter's Name/Affiliation: Karl J. Volk

Contact:

Email: karljvolk@gmail.com

Phone: 845-345-9484

Please provide an executive summary of your response(s), and save as Executive_Summary_NAME_AFFILIATION. Feel free to delete these instructions; then please do not exceed the remainder of this page. We are not doing a good job of safeguarding atomic waste We need HOSS NOW

we must do better we can't have nuclear waste sent back and forth across the country over and over . we need on site safe storage AND NOT ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS That would be the height of racial discrimination and utterly unacceptable. Karl J. Volk

From: Sewell, Michael <Michael.Sewell@pgnmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 08, 2013 2:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Duke Energy comments on discussion draft of the Nuclear Waste Administration Act

Attachments: 2013-04 Comments for Congress on Wyden et al Discussion Draft r3 (LSN)....docx

Attached please find Duke Energy's comments on the draft bill. Do not hesitate to contact us with questions or requests for clarification.

Thank you,

Mike Sewell

Duke Energy

202.331.8090

michael.sewell@duke-energy.com

From: Bobvanden@aol.com

Sent: Wednesday, May 08, 2013 11:56 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Addendum to Comments on Draft Nuclear Waste Bill

Attachments: Question2_Vandenbosch_Professor Emeritus.doc

Attached is a corrected copy of my comments on Question 2 of my comments on Draft Nuclear Waste Administration Act of 2013.

Robert Vandenbosch

Professor Emeritus of Chemistry, University of Washington

6233 52nd Ave. NE

Seattle, WA 98115

206 523 4311

bobvanden@aol.com

From: Bobvanden@aol.com

Sent: Wednesday, May 08, 2013 11:52 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Draft Nuclear Waste Administration Act of 2013

Attachments: Executive_Summary_Vandenbosch_Professor Emeritus Chemistry.doc;
FormQ2_NAME_AFFILIATION.doc; Question1_Vandenbosch_Professor_Emeritus_Chemistry.doc;
Question3_Vandenbosch_Professor Emeritus Chemistry.doc; Question4_Vandenbosch_Professor
Emeritus Chemistry.doc; Question5_Vandenbosch_Professor Emeritus Chemistry.doc;
Question6_Vandenbosch_Professor Emeritus Chemistry.doc; Question7_Vandenbosch_Professor
Emeritus Chemistry.doc; Question8_Vandenbosch_Professor Emeritus Chemistry.doc

Attached in your suggested format are my comments on Draft Nuclear Waste Administration Act of 2013.

Robert Vandenbosch

Professor Emeritus of Chemistry, University of Washington

6233 52nd Ave. NE

Seattle, WA 98115

206 523 4311

bobvanden@aol.com

From: Dennis Collins <djcollinsiv@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 08, 2013 10:32 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Dennis Collins, Northern Illinois Resident

I admittedly oppose storing nuclear waste in the Northern Illinois Region. I have concerns about safety, over the long term as well as short term, of the proposed storage facility. Both transportation as well as storage pose a significant risk to both the residents and the agricultural lifeline that supports this region. No Nuclear Storage in Northern Illinois.

Dennis Collins

From: Daniel Taccarello <daniel.taccarello@enea.it>

Sent: Wednesday, May 08, 2013 3:07 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Nuclear Waste Administration Act of 2013 Request for Feedback

Attachments: QUESTION4_TACCARELLO_ENEA-ITALY.doc

Dear Senators Wyden, Alexander, Feinstein, and Murkowski,

I wish to compliment you for putting together a new siting and consensus(<http://1.usa.gov/10Z5Mpz>)approval process - namely Nuclear Waste Administration Act of 2013 - covering a pilot, a second spent fuel temporary storage and a final disposal facility or repository to be built within the deadlines that have been recently set by the current Obama Administration placing the target opening date for the the high level waste repository in fiscal year 2048.

I do hope you succeed in pushing the Act forward because at present language in your draft Act sounds quite approximative to me especially where you refer to site-specific research or characterization.

The same wording is used for both a temporary storage facility away from nuclear power stations and a HLW repository.

Given the general meaning of "site-specific research" mentioned in your Question4 I suggest you clarify or re-word the paragraph lest many may take to estrange themselves from the issue and many others to think moderate or profound knowledge of a site may suffice to be discussed at public hearings while it is common knowledge the issues at stake are contained in its PEIS and later on in its FEIS.

In a nutshell people will want to know which credible or conservative scenarios have been evaluated in the long term and against which which releases have been calculated after having modeled the site's

geologic behavior in a reliable computer program.(Title 10: Energy
PART 60—DISPOSAL OF HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTES IN GEOLOGIC
REPOSITORIES Subpart E—Technical Criteria § 60.113 Performance
of particular barriers after permanent closure.)

Long term performance assessments are obviously not required for
temporary storage facilities which are designed with much shorter
design lives.

Please find hereto attached my comment to Dr. James Conca's
article "A New Authority for Nuclear Waste" published on
www.forbes.com a week ago-

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamesconca/2013/04/30/a-new-authority-for-nuclear-waste/>
integrally transcribed onto your Question4 template.

with respect,

Daniel Taccarello

=====

MESSAGGIO ISTITUZIONALE

=====

INSIEME PER UNA GRANDE IMPRESA

Destina il 5 per 1000 all'ENEA per ricostruire Città della Scienza

Utilizzeremo il tuo contributo e le nostre competenze tecnico scientifiche per progetti di divulgazione
scientifica con Città della Scienza.

Il nostro codice fiscale è 01320740580

Per maggiori informazioni: www.enea.it

From: sthistle <sthistle@consolidated.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 07, 2013 3:51 PM

To: feedback, nwaste (Energy)

Subject:Comment on nuclear waste management legislation

Attachments: Message 18.eml

Please find my comments attached. Thank you.

"'Who am I? I am one loved by Christ.' Herein lies the foundation of the true self."

-Thomas Merton/Brennan Manning

From: Peter Paul Heilemann <peter.heilemann@wayne.edu>

Sent: Monday, May 06, 2013 6:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Wyden, Murkowski, Feinstein, Alexander proposed legislation on nuclear waste

I urge you to oppose the legislation proposed by Senators Murkowski, Wyden, Feinstein, and Alexander for interim storage of nuclear waste. According to Beyond Nuclear, a reliable source, the proposal does not establish "a strong linkage between 'consolidated interim storage' and permanent disposal" of wastes. Furthermore, it advises "that the risk of de facto permanent parking lot dumps for high-level radioactive waste is unacceptable." Rushing into Mobile Chernobyl shipments, and playing a radioactive waste shell game on the roads, rails, and waterways, makes no sense and takes unnecessary risks. Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) should be required instead, as a common sense interim alternative to this bill's bad ideas.

It should be pointed out that the human toll of nuclear power accidents is probably much greater than that reported in prominent American media. Several responsible sources have placed the toll, in terms of shortened lives, from the Chernobyl nuclear disaster in the tens and even hundreds of thousands.

Peter Heilemann
Detroit, Michigan
ba5792@wayne.edu

From: Jane Gill <jgill12@comcast.net>

Sent: Monday, May 06, 2013 12:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Nuclear Storage

It is a very dangerous idea to move this nuclear material around for temporary storage. We need to develop alternative SAFE methods for our

energy needs!!

susan Gill

From: Leary, Kevin D <kevin.leary@rl.doe.gov>

Sent: Monday, May 06, 2013 10:02 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: RE: Executive Summary Kevin Leary US DOE

Submitter's Name/Affiliation: Kevin D. Leary- US Dept. of Energy (however, I did my thesis at University of Nevada, Reno and worked at Desert Research Institute. I did the first physical groundwater recharge model for Yucca Mountain.

Contact: 509-373-7285

Email: kevin.leary@rl.doe.gov

Phone: 509-373-7285

Executive Summary:

First and foremost, I am writing you as an independent citizen and not as a US DOE employee. I did not read any of the summary documents, however, I have heard a summary of the Blue Ribbon Commission recommendations.

At the time I did my research on Yucca Mountain, the State of Nevada Nuclear Waste Project Office funded my research project and I had nothing to do with DOE. My funding was provided as a result of the State of Nevada litigating US DOE allowing the State of Nevada to perform independent research on Yucca Mountain. I completed my MS thesis (in Hydrogeology/Hydrology) in 1990 at the University of Nevada, Reno. I did one of the first physical groundwater recharge models for Yucca Mountain. In regards to Yucca Mountain being a suitable repository, I think it is technically sound. However, there are some concerns focused around future tectonic and volcanic activity and the impacts these natural events could have on the proposed repository location. Future natural catastrophic events are extremely difficult to predict, therefore, I have an alternate proposal.

With this being said, an alternate location would be nearby Area 3 on the Nevada Test Site. It is an ideal location for a repository for several reasons including the following:

- 1600 feet of zeolite-laden alluvium over first encountered permanent groundwater (note: zeolite clays have a very strong adsorptive capacity for most radionuclides except the actinides); based on the hydraulic characteristics and current conditions, travel time to groundwater is in excess of 500,000 years
- Based upon groundwater recharge studies (e.g., using the Cl-36 isotope), there hasn't been recharge to the groundwater in over 10,000 years

- The site is extremely arid-6.4 inches of average annual precipitation (and a potential evapotranspiration [PET] of approximately 64 inches)
- The site is currently controlled by the US Dept. of Energy so there is no public access
- The site subsurface has already been contaminated by past underground nuclear testing
- Since the site is in a large alluvial basin, fractured hard-rock and tectonic movement are of minor concerns. If a large earthquake were to occur, the zeolite-rich alluvium should envelope the nuclear waste. Concerns for future volcanic activity should be minimum.
- Groundwater movement is quite slow
- Distance to the nearest large populated Area (i.e., Las Vegas) is over 90 miles

To make the proposal more palatable to the public, there should be a grass-roots public outreach to dispel all of the myths surrounding the hazards of such a repository (e.g., a description of surrounding environment in which the waste would be deposited such as the information above) and the relative risks from transportation (as compared to other transportation risks that the community is faced with on a daily basis-e.g., tank cars full of chlorine gas; cyanide pellets used for gold mining in Northern Nevada, etc.).

The federal government should offer-up financial assistance to the State of Nevada such as 100's of millions of dollars each year for higher education, infrastructure, parks and recreation, etc. I think this proposal has both technical and political merit.

Please feel free to contact me regarding this high-level proposal.

Kevin D. Leary

Hydrogeologist/Hydrologist and Certified Professional Soil Scientist

Tech Lead on: Seismic, Meteorological, and Site Environmental Monitoring; Borrow Source Materials; NRDWL/SWL Closure; Engineered Surface Barriers; and NRDA Restoration TWG

U.S. Dept. Of Energy/Richland Operations Office

Federal Bldg; 825 Jadwin-Room 412

Richland, WA 99352

Office: (509)-373-7285 (p); (509)-376-0306 (fax)

kevin.leary@rl.doe.gov

"The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." Sir Edmund Burke

"If you do the same thing over and over again, you cannot expect a different outcome." Albert Einstein

From: Andrew Gold <rosemount@newmexico.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 05, 2013 3:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:<no subject>

To Senate Energy sub-committee members:

I urge you to oppose de-linking "consolidated interim storage" and permanent disposal.

Moving massive amounts of high level radioactive waster across our highway and rail systems to INTERIM storage facilities is an unwarranted and highly dangerous temporary step towards proper disposal.

It will require moving these same wastes again and so will risk more devastating accidents and/or terrorists' targeted attacks.

Instead we should be putting into place sound plans for long-term disposal which will require one shipment from each of the current temporary sites.

Thank yu for your consideration.

Andrew Gold;Santa Fe, NM

From: Shoshannah Benmosché <biophilial@verizon.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 05, 2013 1:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:No to high costs and increased health risks from contamination and weapons proliferation if HLR waste storage is centralized.

"The proposal in this current draft would invite not only a serious nuclear weapons proliferation risk, but also a risk of widespread radioactive contamination of the environment downwind and downstream of existing sites, along transport routes and at volume unrestricted "interim" dumpsites. It would also cost taxpayers and/or ratepayers many tens of billions of dollars."

Why is HOSS not considered? Surely its engineering problems can be more cost effectively remedied for in-situ dry-cask permanent storage where the geology permits or for safer transport from other less geologically stable sites to a permanent repository.

From: Jeannie Pollak <jeannie22@roadrunner.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 05, 2013 12:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Hardened On-Site Nuclear Waste Storage

For the second year in a row, U.S. Senators have introduced the latest Mobile Chernobyl bill on the eve of the Chernobyl nuclear catastrophe anniversary. Please use Hardened On-Site Storage as a common sense alternative to this bad proposal. Please do NOT put my children at risk with this bad proposal. We need to stop making nuclear waste. Nuclear energy is a bad energy alternative. Jeannie Pollak
Oxnard, CA 93036-6210

From: Richard Crozier <riccrozier@embarqmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 05, 2013 4:15 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:mobile Chernobyls

Harden sites for storage of nuclear materials. Don't endanger us any more than you already have! No nukes! Shut down all Fukushimas! From: Shoshannah Benmosché <biophilial@verizon.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 04, 2013 4:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Current draft proposal for high-level radioactive waste management: No thank you!

"This proposal would launch shipments of high-level radioactive waste onto the roads, rails, and waterways in unprecedented numbers, bound for "consolidated interim storage sites," from which they would have to be removed someday, to permanent dumpsites. Unless, that is, they never are transferred -- which would lead to de facto permanent surface storage, parking lot dumps for high-level radioactive waste."

Why is HOSS not considered? Surely its engineering problems can be more cost effectively remedied for in-situ dry-cask permanent storage where the geology permits and safer transport from other sites.

From: des72ee@q.com

Sent: Saturday, May 04, 2013 2:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Two Cents worth

I completely support bringing Nuclear waste into Idaho to be housed at locations within the INL. Whether it is interim or long term it would be an overall benefit to Southeastern Idaho and it is well documented to be a safe location, with no ill effect to the environment. We need to re-evaluate the 1995 Settlement Agreement and stop moving the waste.

I have previously worked for the ICP (Idaho Cleanup Project) and am currently working at the Naval Reactors Facility. I am well aware of concerns, both legitimate and those that have no validity, but are fear based. We need to move forward and preserve our position and the economic future of the area.

Sincerely,

Desiree Lowney

From: shelhoro@gmail.com on behalf of Shel Horowitz <shel@principledprofit.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 04, 2013 6:58 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Current draft is a BAD bill

The best solution for storing high-level rad waste is to stop generating it in the first place. Until we have technology (and communications systems to people who might not even recognize English writing or a contemporary computer file) that can safely and flawlessly isolate these highly toxic, corrosive, and radioactive materials from the environment for at least 100,000 years (250,000 would be safer), we have no business generating them.

We should use the Precautionary Principle and stop generating this waste.

In the meantime, we do need to address long-term storage of the waste already generated. Hardened on-site cask storage, while far from perfect, is a far better idea than the mobile "solution."

I am the author of eight books including Nuclear Lessons.

Shel Horowitz - copywriter, marketing consultant, author, speaker

Affordable, ethical, effective marketing materials and strategies

"Helping you find the sweet spot of green AND profitable"

Sign the Business Ethics Pledge - Help Change the World

<<http://www.business-ethics-pledge.org>>

<http://www.greenandprofitable.com> / <http://www.frugalmarketing.com>

mailto:shel@greenandprofitable.com * 413-586-2388

Twitter: @ShelHorowitz

Award-winning author: Guerrilla Marketing Goes Green

Blog on GreenBusiness/Marketing/Politics/Ethics:

<http://greenandprofitable.com/shels-blog/>

From: Jean Beck <jeanb2020@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 03, 2013 9:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

I urge you to reject any plans to transport nuclear waste via trucks across the USA. Nuclear energy is far from green, far from safe. I oppose nuclear energy and its waste products.

Jean Beck

Lynnwood, WA

From: Dave Morrison <docdave100@msn.com>

Sent: Friday, May 03, 2013 6:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy); cindy@beyondnuclear.org

Subject:FW: [CTSOS] Graphene Newest Feat: Cleaning Up Radioactive Water

Please consider this as a start to a solution...

To: no-new-nukes-yall@yahoogroups.com; ctsos@yahoogroups.com; ETList@yahoogroups.com

From: remyc@prodigy.net

Date: Thu, 17 Jan 2013 18:01:20 -0500

Subject: [CTSOS] Graphene Newest Feat: Cleaning Up Radioactive Water

<http://earthtechling.com/2013/01/graphenes-newest-feat-cleaning-up-radioactive-water>

<<http://earthtechling.com/2013/01/graphenes-newest-feat-cleaning-up-radioactive-water>>

Graphene's Newest Feat: Cleaning Up Radioactive Water

<http://earthtechling.com/2013/01/graphenes-newest-feat-cleaning-up-radioactive-water/>

January 14th, 2013

by Beth Buczynski <http://earthtechling.com/author/beth/>

It's probably been a while since you've thought about the Fukushima <http://earthtechling.com/2012/12/powerful-compact-robot-developed-for-fukushima-clean-up/> nuclear disaster that rocked Japan, and international headlines, in 2011. Despite the fact that the media have moved on, the arduous process of cleaning up and decontaminating the area is a daily reality for the Japanese.

One of Fukushima's worst catastrophes was the direct result of the nuclear plant being built so close to the coastline. The idea of contamination inside a nuclear facility is terrifying enough, without the thought that it's running directly into the ocean we all share. New research <http://www.gizmag.com/graphene-oxide-radioactive-water/25767/> out of Houston's Rice University and Lomonosov Moscow State University may have discovered a way graphene, that miraculous substance, can reverse even this environmental disaster.

In case you're not familiar, graphene <http://www.earthtechling.com/tag/graphene/> is a substance made of pure carbon, with atoms arranged in a regular hexagonal pattern similar to graphite, but in a one-atom thick sheet. It is very light, with a 1 square meter sheet weighing only 0.77 milligrams. It's been suggested that this material could be the key to efficient desalinization, flexible semi-conductors, and better electronics <http://www.earthtechling.com/2012/01/we-geek-out-over-graphene-discovery/> . And now, nuclear waste clean-up.

According to researchers at the aforementioned Universities, when flakes of graphene oxide are added to contaminated water, it causes the radionuclides to condense into clumps. Those clumps can then be separated and disposed of. The researchers focused on removing radioactive isotopes of the actinides and lanthanides – the 30 rare earth elements in the periodic table – from liquids, rather than solids or gases. “Graphene oxide introduced to simulated wastes coagulated within minutes, quickly clumping the worst toxins,” said <http://news.rice.edu/2013/01/08/another-tiny-miracle-graphene-oxide-soaks-up-radioactive-waste-2/> chemist Stepan Kalmykov. The process worked across a range of pH values.

In addition to possibly assisting in decontamination efforts at Fukushima, the researchers say this graphene-based process could also help the natural gas industry <http://www.earthtechling.com/tag/natural-gas/> clean up its act. “When groundwater comes out of a well and it's radioactive above a certain level, they can't put it back into the ground,” said chemist James Tour. “It's too hot. Companies have to ship contaminated water to repository sites around the country at very large expense.” The ability to quickly filter out contaminants on-site would save a great deal of money.”

—:~:—

Reply via web post

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/CTSOS/post%3b_ylc=X3oDMTJxNG9oYXVqBF9TAzk3MzU5NzE0BGdycElkAzI5ODg1ODMEZ3Jwc3BJZAMxNzA1MDY0MTc3BG1zZ0lkAzEyMzI4BHNIYwNmdHIEc2xrA3JwbHkEc3RpbWUDMTM1ODQ2NTA5MQ--?act=reply&messageNum=12328> Reply to sender

<<mailto:remyc@prodigy.net?subject=Re%3A%20Graphene%20Newest%20Feat%3A%20Cleaning%20Up%20Radioactive%20Water>> Reply to group

<<mailto:CTSOS@yahoogroups.com?subject=Re%3A%20Graphene%20Newest%20Feat%3A%20Cleaning%20Up%20Radioactive%20Water>> Start a New Topic

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/CTSOS/post%3b_ylc=X3oDMTJIYnZzODNhBF9TAzk3MzU5NzE0BGdycElkAzI5ODg1ODMEZ3Jwc3BJZAMxNzA1MDY0MTc3BHNIYwNmdHIEc2xrA250cGMEc3RpbWUDMTM1ODQ2NTA5MQ--> Messages in this topic

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/CTSOS/message/12328%3b_ylc=X3oDMTM2NzcxM2FqBF9TAzk3MzU5NzE0BGdycElkAzI5ODg1ODMEZ3Jwc3BJZAMxNzA1MDY0MTc3BG1zZ0lkAzEyMzI4BHNIYwNmdHIEc2xrA3Z0cGMEc3RpbWUDMTM1ODQ2NTA5MQR0cGNJZAMxMjMyOA--> (1)

Recent Activity:

Visit Your Group

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/CTSOS%3b_ylc=X3oDMTJlcHMwYmg5BF9TAzk3MzU5NzE0BGdycElkAzI5ODg1ODMEZ3Jwc3BJZAMxNzA1MDY0MTc3BHNIYwN2dGwEc2xrA3ZnaHAec3RpbWUDMTM1ODQ2NTA5MQ-->

The CTSOS List is the official list serv

and Yahoo Group for the

Greenburbs website:

<http://www.greenburbs.com>

Everything Solar & Green in Fairfield County

From: neil stecker <neile1@frontiernet.net>

Sent: Friday, May 03, 2013 6:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:nuclear fuel

Neil Stecker

neile1@frontiernet.net

CUSTOM CREATIONS WOODWORKS

49739 153RD Place

Tamarack, MN 55787

218-426-4067

TrueNortwoods.com

<http://customcreationswoodworking.wordpress.com/>

DEAR PERSONS,

Your idea to waste time and money moving what should never been created, is so asinine, as to be laughable! do you own a railroad, trucking, storage facility?

BUILD Any, All, cooling tanks needed for LONG TERM STORAGE, WHERE CREATED!

Employ local people to build storage tanks, store safely as long as it is radioactive! 100 Million Years.

Or, send it to you and your investors can store it awhile, in your basements!?!

Germany, is headed for 80% renewables and ending NUCLEAR POWER/ BOMBS!

I would be available to consult, for Half the normal costs. Contacts above.

Sincerely,

nes

From: Donna Selquist <dselquist@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 03, 2013 5:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Transporting nuclear material and waste

I want to urge you to block a rush into Mobile Chernobyl risks merely to play a radioactive waste shell game on the roads, rails, and waterways. Please consult with Chairman Wyden and other members of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee, and tell them not to play this shell game with nuclear material.

Thank you.

From: Marti Olesen <molesen12@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 03, 2013 5:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Do not support mobile Chernobyls. Support HOSS instead

We urge all Senators to oppose de-linking "consolidated interim storage" and permanent disposal. We Urge all of you to block a rush into Mobile Chernobyl risks merely to play a radioactive waste shell game on the roads, rails, and waterways. Weigh in with Chairman Wyden and other members of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee.

Let them know Americans do not support this foolish action that will easily expose our entire nation to the blights of nuclear disaster if even one train or truck is sabotaged or has an accident. Confine the damage to the areas where it already exists and work on stabilizing and decontaminating those sites instead.

Thank you,

Mr. and Mrs. Larry Olesen

Ponca, ARFrom: Laura M. Ohanian <lmo@efn.org>

Sent: Friday, May 03, 2013 5:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:re: "Discussion Draft" of proposed legislation on high-level radioactive waste management

Laura M. Ohanian

Eugene, OR 97401

lmo@efn.org

541-342-7786

To whom it may concern:

No Mobile Chernobyls! Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) makes a lot more sense than this bad bill. HOSS calls for emptying vulnerable high-level radioactive waste storage pools into on-site dry cask storage, but would require significant upgrades to the safety, security, and environmental protections associated with dry cask storage: safeguards against accidents and natural disasters; concealment, distancing between casks, and fortification against attacks; and quality assurance on cask design and fabrication to ensure they will last not decades but centuries, without leaking radioactivity into the environment. Nearly 200 environmental groups, representing all 50 states, have endorsed HOSS, calling for it for well over a decade now.

I urge that a strong linkage between "consolidated interim storage" and permanent disposal be re-established in this proposed legislation. The risk of de facto permanent parking lot dumps for high-level radioactive waste is unacceptable! Rushing into Mobile Chernobyl shipments, and playing a radioactive waste shell game on the roads, rails, and waterways, makes no sense and takes unnecessary risks for

everyone. I urge that Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) be required instead, as a commonsense interim alternative to this bill's bad ideas.

And in the meantime, since it's obvious that we still don't have a clue as to how to deal with nuclear waste, we certainly should not be creating any more -- I support an immediate cessation of the production and use of nuclear anything, if you care about the kind of world you want to leave to our kids and grandkids.

Thank you,

Laura M. Ohanian

From: Gordon Howard <fortescu@optonline.net>

Sent: Friday, May 03, 2013 4:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Nuclear Waste (Spent Rods---Garbage)

I have to ask my self why are you proposing this BILL ??? Rushing into high-level radioactive waste shipments on the roads, rails, and waterways makes no sense. it needs to be contained by Hardened on Site Storage, the question is who pays for it to happen ??? Is that your motive ??? What planet do you live on this could affect your family's well being ???

Gordon Howard 631-878-1716

From: Allison Ostrer <aostrer@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 03, 2013 3:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:No Mobile Chernobyls on our roads

Dear Senator Wyden,

I am opposed to shipping dangerous nuclear waste on our highways.

Rushing into "Mobile Chernobyl" shipments and playing a radioactive waste shell game on the roads, rails, and waterways, makes no sense and takes unnecessary risks. Instead Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) be required as a common sense interim alternative to this bill's bad ideas.

I hope you will consider my thoughts and those of all Americans who fear for our safety from nuclear waste.

Sincerely,

Allison Ostrer

Seattle, WA

From: mjl2010environmental@juno.com

Sent: Friday, May 03, 2013 2:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Nuclear Waste Disposal

Sir/Ma'am,

I have been following nuclear waste disposal for some time. I am not sure if a new federal agency is needed for this though. However if you do this, please mirror at least CFR's 10, 29, 40 and 49 and all relevant statutory requirements for this.

Michael Luzzo

509-42--0982

mjl2010environmental@juno.com

From: Jane Darden-Young <connieyoung@mac.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 01, 2013 7:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Don't Waste Aiken SC

To the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee:

Don't Waste Aiken is a grass roots cross section of our community that wants to make sure our voices are heard. We represent tax paying citizens, college students, grandparents, Democrats, Republicans, and we are committed to not allowing commercial spent nuclear fuel and reprocessing to come to the SRS or South Carolina. We do not feel that the SRS should continue to be a dumping ground for the World and we want the legacy nuclear weapons waste that is just like the stuff at Hanford to be cleaned up before it kills us! There has never been a real plan for the nuclear industry's waste disposal site unless by gun point... which should indicate to you, elected officials, that the citizens of the US just don't want that kind of energy here. We ask that the government quit subsidizing the nuclear industry with our tax payer dollars and we ask that our elected officials commit to real renewable and clean energy as a focus for your committee.

Most importantly...Don't Waste Aiken- citizen's saying no to 70,000 tons of commercial spent nuclear fuel coming to the SRS and South Carolina! www.dontwasteaiken.com

Sincerely,

Jesse Colin Young and Connie Darden-Young...founders