

# Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
1	A Stable Regulator in a Dynamic Environment	External Stakeholder	**One of the major criticisms of how the Japanese government handled Fukushima is how unregulated and unsupervised its nuclear plants were. This is a step in that same direction!! **	The agency's Near-Term Japan Task Force conducted a thorough review of all available information from the Fukushima-Daichii events and developed a comprehensive set of recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety. The staff is working towards the implementation of those recommendations.
2	A Stable Regulator in a Dynamic Environment	External Stakeholder	I've been advised that the NRC is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.	The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."
3	Organizational Excellence	OE and HR	<p><u>Page 24, under Operational Excellence Strategies and Means to Support the Strategies</u></p> <p>Safety Culture            1. Promote <b>an organizational culture with a strong emphasis on safety culture</b> and an open, collaborative work environment where individuals are comfortable speaking up and sharing concerns and differing views without fear of negative consequences.            • Means—provide training <b>as needed</b> and strengthen communication to support <b>an organizational culture with a strong emphasis on safety culture</b> and an open, collaborative work environment, conduct assessment and evaluation activities to identify areas for continuous improvement, and coordinate with the agency's outwardly focused safety culture activities (see Safety Strategy 7).</p>	Comment accepted
4	Safety	NRC Employee	<p>The safety-goal strategic outcomes (see page 7) give the impression that the NRC only desires to prevent radiological hazards of licensed materials. It should be noted that we desire to prevent exposures to hazardous chemicals used with, or produced from, licensed material.</p> <p>My suggestion is to add a footnote to the third and fourth safety-goal strategic outcomes that reads, "For fuel cycle facilities, this extends to hazardous chemicals used with, or produced from, radioactive material consistent with 10 CFR Part 70 and proposed amendments to 10 CFR Part 40."</p>	Comment not accepted – chemical safety is not a strategic-level concern of the NRC. NRC works with the Environmental Protection Agency, other Federal agencies, and the States to address a variety of risks, including chemical contaminants.

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
5	Safety	NRC Employee	<p>It would be appropriate to include language to acknowledge the NRC safety objectives in the area of chemical safety. One specific insert to the list of bullets for the safety goal strategic outcomes is suggested as shown below.</p> <p><b>Safety Goal Strategic Outcomes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevent the occurrence of nuclear reactor accidents.</li> <li>• Prevent the occurrence of inadvertent criticality events.</li> <li>• <b>Prevent the occurrence of acute chemical exposures from hazardous chemicals produced by licensed material or produced by a source which results in increased radiation risk</b></li> <li>• Prevent the occurrence of acute radiation exposures resulting in fatalities.</li> <li>• Prevent the occurrence of releases of radioactive materials that result in significant radiation exposures.</li> <li>• Prevent the occurrence of releases of radioactive materials that cause significant adverse environmental impacts.</li> </ul> <p>Including this bullet would keep chemical safety on a par with radiological safety and criticality prevention consistent with the NRC policy. The suggested language is an adaptation of language in the 1988 MOU between NRC and OSHA. The suggested additional bullet reflects the balance presented in specific requirements of 10 CFR Part 70.61.</p>	<p>Comment not accepted – chemical safety is not a strategic-level concern of the NRC. NRC works with the Environmental Protection Agency, other Federal agencies, and the States to address a variety of risks, including chemical contaminants.</p>
6	Safety	External Stakeholders (Numerous)	<p>While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.</p> <p>Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety. We need honest information that takes into account the long-term cost/benefit analysis of nuclear power and which assumes safety and health are more important than economics. Pull no punches.</p> <p>This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?</p> <p>For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."</p>
7	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>We need honest information that takes into account the long-term cost/benefit analysis of nuclear power and which assumes safety and health are more important than economics. Pull no punches.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.</p>

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
8	Safety	External Stakeholder	I just want to add to this letter a few questions. Is there any one in this government who is really concerned about the health and safety of people who live within a 50 mile radius of a nuclear power plant? Is there anyone in this government who really cares that people living in the service area of for -profit monopoly energy companies are forced to pay moeny to these monopolies every month? Is there anyone in this government conceredned about longterm national security for everyone in this contry? It seems to me and a lot of other people that no one is this government cares about the "regular" citizens anymore! If any of you really do care then you will stand up for the "regular " citizens and not allow this change to occur!! In fact it would be GREAT if you all were forward thinkers for all of the US citizens and pushed for the implementation of truly safe and affordable renewable forms of energy production.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
9	Safety	External Stakeholder	WE NEED CLEAN ENERGY NOW! Nuclear energy is dangerous! Stop the foolishness - get real and PROTECT THE PEOPLE & OUR LANDS!	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
10	Safety	External Stakeholder	I wanted to urge the NRC to put the public health and safety first, and require a license amendment to address the processing of uranium from municipal water systems. The disposal of spent nuclear fuel and other civilian radioactive waste requires more study before any new uranium processing facilities or nuclear power reactors are licensed.  The conventional uranium mines and mills being proposed in the Grants Mineral District of New Mexico are destined to repeat the environmental degradation of the last century. Our ground water resources, traditional cultures and the public health deserve more protection. We need to enlarge the debate on nuclear issues toward a nuclear-free carbon-free energy system.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
11	Safety	External Stakeholder	The insane and brain-dead Congress has and will stop any legislation against the NRC, thus the idea of dumping the NRC is moot. If my government was responsive to constituents, we would have stopped nuclear waste production by reactors, stopped killing people with radiation sickness and come into the 21st Century clean of such a killing and stupid idea of energy production. Not to mention the past of bombs and bomb making. You are on the line, Congresspeople, because you will not get re-elected if you fail to stop nuclear waste and create an agency that will supervise nuclear activities for the people, not for richy riches who do not care about us.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
12	Safety	External Stakeholder	The whole world watched last spring as the earthquake and tsunami in Japan caused a catastrophic failure at the Fukushima power plant. The effects of this failure will continue to be felt for decades. Lives will be lost, illness will affect both Japan's citizens and those around the world. At the same time, the NRC drags its feet on dealing with safety of American citizens.	The agency's Near-Term Japan Task Force conducted a thorough review of all available information from the Fukushima-Daichii events and developed a comprehensive set of recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety. The staff is working towards the implementation of those recommendations.

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
13	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>Language on this page should be changed to:                      The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is ensured by thoroughly regulating the nuclear industr. Regulations stress independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."</p>
14	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>The Nuclear Regulatory Commission ought to change its focus away from what it can do for nuclear utilities and toward a new emphasis on public health and safety, as was intended by Congress when the agency was created in 1974 from the old Atomic Energy Commission, which had the dual and conflicting mission of both promoting and regulating nuclear power.</p> <p>The new Strategic Plan is the ideal platform to do so.</p> <p>But the proposed Plan does not do this. On the very first page of this new plan (page 5 of the document), the following paragraph appears:</p> <p>Principles of Good Regulation                      The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is enabled by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability. In addition, regulatory actions are effective, realistic, and timely.</p> <p>Nowhere in any of the NRC's statutory documents is it stated that the purpose of NRC regulation is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels</p> <p>I believe that the first page of the Strategic Plan should state clearly that the agency's purpose is to regulate for the protection of public health and safety.</p> <p>The Strategic Plan should say that the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety. Oddly, this statement is not included in the Plan, and this omission should be fixed before the Plan is adopted.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."</p>
15	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>STOP THE CONTINUING DEATH AND DESTRUCTION OF THE PLANET FROM FUTURE NUCLEAR MELTDOWNS AND DEADLY NUCLEAR WASTE PRODUCTS AND POLLUTION.</p>	<p>The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.</p>

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
16	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>The NRC...an agency whose commission is to regulate the nuclear industry.</p> <p>Yet the NRC blatantly ignores, dismisses and worse-laughs off, abundant proof that most reactors currently licensed in this country are extremely and inherently dangerous to significant segments of the population. By continuing to license these facilities without properly and fully re-evaluating them in light of new information and public concern, they are failing in the performance of their commission.</p> <p>They should not make claims of "safety" which they cannot back up. It is NOT their job to protect and defend the nuclear industry. Their job is to REGULATE. Yet now they want to enable the industry they are commissioned to regulate?!! This is a blatant conflict of interest!</p> <p>It is well known that two reactors in my region in California are in very active earthquake territories. It would be IMPOSSIBLE to safely evacuate the population for 50 miles around either of these facilities in the event of an emergency. In the name of public safety, they should be closed immediately.</p> <p>They cannot play ostrich forever. Will it take a domestic disaster on the order of Fukushima to get their attention? What will you say then? For it is not a question of maybe....it is a matter of time.</p> <p>What should the NRC be doing? Learning from the lessons of Fukushima. Listening to the nuclear experts, not the industry. Fire any greedy commissioner or staff member who would put personal gain above the public good. This issue is NOT about profits; it is about Public Safety and fulfilling their commission to regulate the nuclear industry - NOT to enable it. Surely they are not so ignorant as to believe that the nuclear industry is not about profits. Their job is the public safety part of the equation. Please ensure that they fulfill it with vigorous diligence.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."</p>

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
17	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>Let me begin by saying that I have been an anti-nuclear activist for over thirty years. I worked at the NJ SANE office in Montclair and with NJ SEA Alliance, as well.</p> <p>I have watched the NRC conscientiously register every incident from the smallest to the gravest while rubber-stamping all applications for relicensing and approving proposals for new reactors to be built and come on-line--despite Three-mile Island, Chernobyl, and even Fukushima. As much of the commission's work is finished by the time the news hits the papers--if it gets printed at all--I have always considered the functions of the NRC to be likened to covert operations: appearing to regulate but proliferating behind closed doors. And now, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels, thereby coming out of the closet.</p> <p>Isn't it now high time that, as overseers to the NRC, you demand that we join Italy, and Germany, and Belgium, and Japan in decommissioning all operating nuclear plants, closing down nuclear facilities, and turning to safe, green--AND NUCLEAR IS NOT GREEN--energy alternatives?</p> <p>Haven't we wasted enough time with the investigations and discussions of possible post-Fukushima safety modifications to the Mark I boiling water reactor, of which we have 23 here in the U.S., given that it's biggest design flaw is that its fuel rods are inserted through gaping holes at the bottom of the reactor? What modification, other than a complete re-design of the reactor, would stop molten fuel from pouring through those holes in the event of a melt-down? And what work-around would prevent the consequent, inevitable containment melt-through?</p> <p>The NRC has never operated with the goal of protecting public health and safety. At last, they have announced that they are suspending the illusion of regulating this industry and from now on will do everything in their power to enable business as usual. It seems to me that you, as our representatives in Washington, are our last chance to end the insanity of splitting atoms to boil water.</p> <p>I have spoken before the NRC on numerous occasions, specifically to shut down Indian Point, the closest reactors not only to my home in northern NJ but also to the residents of, and the daily commuters to, Manhattan. I did so because I knew the NRC had the power, at anytime, to do just that. Now, if NUREG-1614, Vol. 5 goes through unheeded, dear legislators, the NRC--overtly empowered and committed to enabling the industry-- would lose this never tested ability. Indeed, if the NRC ever did try to shut a reactor down, a utility might be able to sue the commission for preventing, rather than enabling, that reactor's operation.</p> <p>For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Help protect the people in New Jersey. Shut down Oyster Creek, Salem and Hope Creek now. And join with Governor Cuomo in calling for the shut down of Indian Point.</p>	<p>The mission of the NRC continues to be the protection of the health and safety of the public and the environment. In addition, the agency's Near-Term Japan Task Force conducted a thorough review of all available information from the Fukushima-Daichii events and developed a comprehensive set of recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety. The staff is working towards the implementation of those recommendations</p>

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
18	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>We should not be enabling nuclear energy, we should be regulating it for its safest possible use as we consider phasing it out. We should be supporting the development of a new future in safer, renewable energy.</p> <p>The choices made today should be defensible to the seventh generation in the future. Choices made for wealth and power are not defensible, not to this generation nor to those in future.</p> <p>Decisions made on behalf of nuclear utilities and corporate interests serve only short-sighted purposes and are not worthy decisions of those in whom the people have granted power. Stop this short-sighted 'Strategic Plan' proposal.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.</p>
19	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>My family and I are extremely upset to learn that the NRC is attempting to redefine what the regulation of the nuclear industry is all about. In the aftermath of Fukushima and other nuclear accidents, most unreported, we find this an abomination. The whole point of regulations is to protect the public - our safety and our health. This must at all times come first.</p> <p>Yet, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels. This wording is not about protecting us, the public, but finding ways for the nuclear industry to market its destructive and dangerous byproducts - to spread the toxics around in other shapes and forms. This is totally unacceptable and it is a betrayal of the public trust in the NRC to be watchdogs over the industry and protectors of public well-being.</p> <p>For far too long, government agencies, corrupted by corporate influence buying and takeover, have been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the interest and well-being of We, the People. In regard to the nuclear industry, the NRC has put the nuclear utilities ahead of We, the People. This must stop and it must stop NOW.</p> <p>The safe future for all of humanity must be one that is nuclear-free and carbon-free. We can do it by taking a few basic first steps - first - stopping the corruption of our government agencies that are meant to protect us, not the nuclear industry and its profits.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment. Furthermore, the updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability." (page #) In addition, the agency's Near-Term Japan Task Force conducted a thorough review of all available information from the Fukushima-Daichii events and developed a comprehensive set of recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety. The staff is working towards the implementation of those recommendations</p>
20	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>Are people incapable of imagining that disaster can strike here just as easily as it does elsewhere? This is a worldwide problem. There is NO reason to relax standards: given the proliferation going on in more places and at more levels than before, it's clear that we need to go in the other direction and stiffen our resolve.</p> <p>I understand that in the NRC draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the purpose of NRC regulations is defined (p. 5) as "enabling" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels. What?!?!? I thought you were supposed to be protecting us all! And the only way to do that is by decreasing the use of nuclear power.</p> <p>I believe that once again money is being considered more important than human lives.</p> <p>Please don't give in and please don't sit by while your colleagues give in.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."</p>

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
21	Safety	External Stakeholder	We can not beleive after the recent events in Japan that the US would be considering any for of Fiscal Nuclear energy. Building new nuclear plants are so opudated. Wjhen we we get the message Nuclear is obsolete for so many reasons. Working with nature in solar wind and hydro energy is the future energy. We must embrace nature and work together.	The agency's Near-Term Japan Task Force conducted a thorough review of all available information from the Fukushima-Daichii events and developed a comprehensive set of recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety. The staff is working towards the implementation of those recommendations.
22	Safety	External Stakeholder	Nuclear energy is not clean energy since the production and disposal of nuclar energy and highly contaminating and that contamination lasts indefinitely. Nuclear energy is not safe since it is a source for nuclear arsenal. Nuclear energy is not cheap, it is extraordinarily expensive: cheap means without including costs of construction, safety monitoring, and waste handling, which if included as it must be, makes nuclear energy the most expensive energy, and the bill is on the shoulders of taxpayers.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
23	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>The purpose of the NRC regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels?</p> <p>What the hell do you people think you're doing? The purpose of the NRC regulations are to protect the public health and safety.</p> <p>Obama is on shaky ground already. This may well push him off the edge into total un-electability. Not that I'm personally going to vote for ANY incumbent. You've all betrayed us.</p> <p>The real question is who I will be supporting. Right now I'm working on a write in candidacy for Bernie Sanders. All it will take is 4,000 votes and I KNOW I can get them!</p> <p>Just how stupid are you people? Herrera is already down the tube, Murray is in swirling around in the toilet due to the Death Committee decision to cut medicare and medicaid. Cantwell is a lost cause to due to her constant personal-pocketbook voting.</p> <p>You guys really know how to screw the nation, don't you?</p> <p><b>WE DO NOT WANT MORE NUCLEAR POWER!</b></p>	The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."
24	Safety	External Stakeholder	Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety. This is why the original AEC was disbanded and regulatory authority was moved to the NRC.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
25	Safety	External Stakeholder	We should be closing down nuclear power and investing in alternative power asap. That's the only sane thing to do, no matter how inconvenient it is.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
26	Safety	External Stakeholder	THE DANGERS OF NUCLEAR POWER/WEAPONS HAS FAR OUT WEIGHED THEIR NECESSITY. THEIR DEVELOPMENT HAS BEEN BASED MORE ON UNREASONABLE FEAR. SCIENCE IS CAPABLE OF BETTER DEVELOPMENTS.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.



## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
27	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>I wish to share with you an open letter to the NRC concerning its proposed new strategic plan:</p> <p>Dear NRC,</p> <p>As you very well know, nuclear power plants come in two varieties: those that are dangerous and those that are less dangerous. However, as you also know, there are no SAFE uses of radioactive and nuclear fuels. They are inherently dangerous (UNSAFE) in all their capacities. If they weren't, there would be no need to regulate them.</p> <p>Up until now, the NRC (established with the split of the old AEC into ERDA for promotion and the NRC for regulation) has been fulfilling its role as the regulating functionary for nuclear power with the idea that uses be as safe as possible while remaining inherently unsafe because supposedly there were no adequate alternative sources of energy. This prior approach of the NRC benefitted the industry but jeopardized public safety immensely; Chernobyl and Fukushima are prime examples of the very real and inevitable consequences of using old-but-still-used nuclear power to fulfill American power-generating needs instead of using new, green and safe technologies.</p> <p>So it comes as a great relief that your new strategic plan includes the "safe and secure" clause as fundamental to the NRC's purpose.</p> <p>How soon after the adoption of this new plan can I expect you to begin shutting down the most unsafe nuclear power plants--the Mark I designs? And then how much later will you begin to shut down the "safer"--but still inherently unsafe--plants? I can't wait until all nuclear power plants are shut down and we finally have only "safe and secure" plants left--that is, none.</p> <p>Also, I wish to applaud your effort to not give in to the enormous pressure and bribes you are exposed to from the nuclear industry. Their offers to you of money and jobs must be intensely attractive; I don't know how you withstand them. Nevertheless, congratulations on withstanding these bribes and insisting that all uses of nuclear energy be safe and secure. We welcome the day when these last-century nightmares will be gone and forgotten along with their corrupting (and dangerous) corporate influence on government. These corporations risk the health and safety of human beings in deference to their sociopathic drive to accumulate endless wealth for themselves at any cost to others. Again, congratulations on withstanding their bribes and being "realistic" and holding onto "clarity" concerning the inherent inability of nuclear power to be safe and secure</p> <p>For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now. And I am glad that this new strategic plan insists that nuclear power be safe and secure--something that is impossible for the industry to achieve--and will lead to the closing of all nuclear power plants.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment. In addition, the agency's Near-Term Japan Task Force conducted a thorough review of all available information from the Fukushima-Daichii events and developed a comprehensive set of recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety. The staff is working towards the implementation of those recommendations</p>
28	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>How many tragic warnings do we need?</p> <p>I urge you to make sure the public interest and safety are FIRST, not BEHIND the industry's desire to make a buck.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.</p>

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
29	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>Dear Sir or Madam:"</p> <p>In its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.</p> <p>What is this about "enabling"? Here we are, a society that has been unable to come up with a safe, permanent disposal of our nuclear waste, what we already have. How can we talk about adding to this waste without first resolving our present disposal problem? I don't get it! Please send me somebody who does.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."</p>
30	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>Please DO NOT assume that the NRC's role is to permit the use of nuclear fuels. Its role is to oversee any current use and PROHIBIT any use that endangers people.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.</p>
31	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>At the same time that NRC is delaying implementing post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is redefining principles of nuclear regulation. In its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says on page 5, the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" use of radioactive materials &amp; nuclear fuels. No, that isn't the purpose. The purpose of NRC regulations is to protect public health &amp; safety.</p> <p>If the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous? Given this language, if NRC did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue it for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?</p> <p>For too long government has been putting interests &amp; profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. That's what the whole #OWS movement is about now. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of the citizenry.</p> <p>I write as an emeritus member of the American Institute of Biological Sciences (AIBS).</p> <p>Reference:</p> <p>"Summary for Decision-makers", /Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Synthesis/ (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2005).</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."</p>

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
32	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>Dear Elected Representative,</p> <p>When one observes the statistics provided by Department of Labor concerning the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program (EEOICP) of which the mission states: "The mission of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program is to deliver benefits to eligible employees and former employees of the Department of Energy, its contractors and subcontractors or to certain survivors of such individuals, as provided in the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act. The mission also includes delivering benefits to certain beneficiaries of Section five of the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act." The statistics demonstrate nuclear power and its fuels are dangerous and causes death and sickness.</p> <p>There have been false claims made that there have been no deaths as a result of civilian nuclear power generation. This claim which has been made by some of the Tennessee Valley area's politicians is false and very misleading. Unless one contends that nuclear fuels are not part of the nuclear power generation process.</p> <p>Currently EEOICP Department of Labor statistics demonstrate there have been \$7,527,979,657 in claims paid to 87,219 unique individual workers represented by 148,091 cases reported. The conclusion, nuclear fuels have killed and sickened thousands of workers, it is killing and sickening thousands of good working folks now.</p> <p>The continued false mantra that nuclear power is clean and safe is to deny the facts. Facts which demonstrate an intentional planned deceitful policy developed by the nuclear industry and adopted by not only politicians such as yourself but the Regulatory Agency which is sworn to protect the public's health and welfare, the NRC.</p> <p>The NRC and supporting politicians should be ashamed of their deceitful and false mantra designed to support the nuclear industry and thus telling citizens you don't matter as long as the nuclear industry reaps billions of dollars in profits.</p> <p>The purpose of a regulator is to regulate an industry to prevent threats to the citizenry's health and welfare. Not justify the continued practice of the industry's lobby working to determine enforcement actions and providing payola to politicians via PACs hidden contribution sources. Not to mention the nuclear industry's hundreds of millions of dollars in lobby efforts to justify nuclear power which more often than not is a tirade of false mantras and propaganda.</p>	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
33	Safety	External Stakeholder	What is happening to our protection??? NO NUKES!	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
34	Safety	External Stakeholder	"Isn't it OBVIOUS by now? Radioactive substances and nuclear power/weapons are BAD IDEAS all the way from uranium mining to waste disposal. BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE close and dismantle ALL existing nuclear applications and BUILD NO MORE!"	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
35	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>I am particularly concerned about the unstable era we are entering. In addition to terrorists who might target nuclear facilities, there are the dangers of extreme storms (tornadoes, hurricanes, floods) disrupting the support structures and personnel who maintain reactors. In addition, we are entering unstable financial periods. What happens were nuclear reactor workers are not paid?</p> <p>It is most important that the tons and tons of spent fuels now sitting in open pools of circulating water outside of containment, that these be put into secure dry cask storage. Please assure that the NRC will make nuclear utilities do this.</p>	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment. The NRC's mission includes ensuring the safe and secure storage of spent fuel.

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
36	Safety	External Stakeholder	WE HAVE SEEN TOO MANY EXAMPLES OF UNSAFE AND DANGEROUS SITUATIONS WITH NUCLEAR POWER. WE DO NOT NEED ANY MORE. There are other much safer power sources available that should be developed. Until these are fully implemented and used there is no need for nuclear power, and it should definitely be left alone.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
37	Safety	External Stakeholder	We need a Regulator, who is focused on safety, safety, and safety; and acting (would you believe acting rather than studying?) on any step likely to improve safety not confusing its role with that of an enabler intent on getting more industry.  My view of history - removing that role confusion was why we stopped the AEC, and divided its conflicting functions between the DOE and the NRC.	The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."
38	Safety	External Stakeholder	Eliminating nuclear power, regardless of the time frame, is the goal. It is too dangerous, and we have something called wastes that take thousands of years to become nontoxic. Wake up and regulate the nuclear power industry with the goal of elimination before your children reach adulthood. This is for them.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
39	Safety	External Stakeholder	Although nuclear energy is touted as clean energy, the extremely slowly deteriorating waste created and the lack of places that are willing to be a dumping ground for this waste make it far "dirtier" than even coal. We need to focus our contry's energy future on harnessing the tides as is happening now in Eastport, Maine and on wind energy. Nuclear energy is as expensive as it is dangerous when all factors are considered.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
40	Safety	External Stakeholder	THERE IS NO SAFE USE OF RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS. IF THERE IS ANY INTELLIGENCE, INDEED ANY CONCERN FOR LIFE OUT THERE, THE ONLY SAFE AND RESPONSIBLE ATTITUDE IS TO CEASE AND DESIST FROM TAMPERING WITH IT.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
41	Safety	External Stakeholder	I find it interesting to note that in your actions you seem to disregard the truth that you are also a member of the public. Or does your exalted position in the government grant you an automatic cloak of anti-radioactive layers that will protect you from radioactive fallout and pollution, etc. If so , you are truly lax in presenting this to your constituents who elected you to preserve and protect. If not, preserving and protecting means to de-regulate because it has been proven over and over that nuclear anything is unsafe. Even the discoverers of this energy wrote to discourage the government from using the knowledge at all, Even trying to use it safely - does not work! Example - Chernobyl, Fukushima. How many accidents will have to occur before you get it. Or are you getting money from the nuclear industry who cares not a fig who will be harmed or destroyed in some horrible way. Is this ethical?" Are you being ethical in your decision making. Get rid of it. It is not necessary for the good of mankind. it may destroy our very environment. And if the environment dies, we all die - gasping, choking, screaming with pain of radiation burns. Is this what you want for your children? Well, you should be looking ahead to your re-election. If you continue along these lines, we will find someone else for your office.	The agency's Near-Term Japan Task Force conducted a thorough review of all available information from the Fukushima-Daichii events and developed a comprehensive set of recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety. The staff is working towards the implementation of those recommendations.

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
42	Safety	External Stakeholder	I empathically insist that we must have regulation and not enabling of this inherently dangerous industry.	The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."
43	Safety	External Stakeholder	Public safety should ALWAYS trump corporate profits. Nuclear material is NEVER safe and has no place near human habitation- and that includes the entire earth.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
44	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>You need -- the public DEMANDS - that you start paying attention to us. Public health comes before all of your other concerns. After all, it's YOUR children and grandchildren as well as mine.</p> <p>In its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels. This is absurd. There is absolutely nothing in your mandate that asks you to do anything but protect the public from the dark side of nuclear energy production.</p> <p>It's insulting that you are now straying so far from your mandate. Have you been bought out by lobbyists and industry reps? What happens when there is no regulation? Mass suicide by design?</p>	The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."
45	Safety	External Stakeholder	IT IS unconscionable to do anything other than to put the safety of citizens first!	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
46	Safety	External Stakeholder	The NRC must be the agency which first protects public health and safety. Only when a particular nuclear application including any waste generated can be shown to be absolutely safe and harmless should any nuclear applications or facilities be permitted to exist. There are safe, economically viable and clean energy producing technologies which can generate electricity. Nuclear energy generation and use should only be approved when it is as safe as alternate means of generating electricity.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
47	Safety	External Stakeholder	Many of our nuclear reactors are either old and have had known safety issues or are located in geographic areas at risk for damage due to earthquakes or flooding.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
48	Safety	External Stakeholder	The safety of the American people should come first - and that should be the bottom line. If nuclear power can not be made safe then it should not be made and the NRC should be in charge of making that decision.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
49	Safety	External Stakeholder	In actuality, no amount of nuclear power is ultimately safe for our planet. All resources are better used investing in safe, renewable technologies, but in the meantime the NRC should be first and foremost making sure the existing facilities stay as safe as possible	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
50	Safety	External Stakeholder	I am very concerned about the dangers of Nuclear Power. In Japan large areas have been contaminated where food was grown. It has devastated the local regions near the nuclear power plant. I don't see any protections from the NRC that would prevent this from happening in the United States.	The agency's Near-Term Japan Task Force conducted a thorough review of all available information from the Fukushima-Daichii events and developed a comprehensive set of recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety. The staff is working towards the implementation of those recommendations.
51	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>Nuclear power is NOT safe. No one wants the resulting waste buried in their neighborhood. To "educate and give incentives" to folks who will allow nuclear waste in their neighborhoods is wrong. If the truth is told and people aren't propagandized in to accepting nuclear wastes in their neighborhoods, no one will welcome it. To give "incentives" for allowing nuclear wastes into ones neighborhoods is bribery.</p> <p>To continue to punch holes in the earth and bury nuclear wastes is irresponsible. (Out of sight out of mind). It's a disservice to future generations and is poisoning the environment and us with new pollutants which never existed in these forms in our environment before nuclear power came on the scene.</p> <p>Nuclear is NOT safe. Admit it and move on to wind and solar. Use the "education and incentive" money to educate people on the value of conserving energy and spending less!</p>	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
52	Safety	External Stakeholder	PUBLIC HEALTH is FIRST in importance simultaneous with ECOSYSTEM HEALTH...no nuclear regulatory organization should ever be allowed to advocate for anything to do with nuclear power or weapons, neither of which are ecologically or socially sustainable enterprises. The nuclear power industry has repeatedly proven itself to be criminally corrupt, covert and bad for the integrity of the ecosystem and for the public good. Civil service demands that you do everything you can to undermine the nuclear industry by ANY MEANS NECESSARY!!! We will remember your actions and will hold you directly accountable as a decision maker in a party that is a corporation supporting nuclear power itself. Don't forget!	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
53	Safety	External Stakeholder	Nuclear energy simply cannot be made safe enough considering the consequences of even one catastrophe. It just isn't worth the risk. This is especially true because the taxpayers will be footing the bill for the great majority of any accident and our fellow Americans the affects of radiation.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
54	Safety	External Stakeholder	SHIFT THE NRC AWAY FROM WHAT THE GOVERNMENT CAN DO FOR NUCLEAR UTILITIES AND TOWARD A NEW EMPHASIS ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY!	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
55	Safety	External Stakeholder	We have nuclear power plants in this country with the same design as Fukushima, and we have the same chance of disasters caused from earthquakes, tsunamis, flooding, and equipment malfunction.	The agency's Near-Term Japan Task Force conducted a thorough review of all available information from the Fukushima-Daichii events and developed a comprehensive set of recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety. The staff is working towards the implementation of those recommendations.
56	Safety	External Stakeholder	I lived and worked in Japan and knew many Hibakusha - survivors who were struck down with cancers and did not survive a second time. There are no safe nuclear materials, nuclear bombs, nor reactors for that matter. This organization is all we have between us and corporations thirsting for profits from nuclear industries. Please re-enforce its moral and civic purpose of NRC and its regulations.	The agency's Near-Term Japan Task Force conducted a thorough review of all available information from the Fukushima-Daichii events and developed a comprehensive set of recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety. The staff is working towards the implementation of those recommendations.
57	Safety	External Stakeholder	Health and safety come first, not as an after thought. The NRC already is the handmaiden of the nuclear industry kowtowing to every shortcut and pie in the sky scheme they come up with. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
58	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>It is essential that leaders, like yourself, in a position to influence "peacetime" nuclear energy projects, overseen by the NRC, become informed about the information highlighted by the Nuclear Inform./Resource Service ("Atomic Radiation is More Harmful to Women") citing a 2006 report from the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), showing that women, as well as children, are at much greater risk of dying from "peacetime" radiation-induced cancer) than men. The world's radiation standards were originally developed to ALLOW exposure rather than to prevent it (i.e., "permissible" levels of radiation exposure for a male worker at the Manhattan Project). The formula vastly under-calculates the health risks today: The radiation levels to the general public, allowed by the NRC standards, would actually result in 1 FATAL cancer in every 286 people (adult men) and worse for women. Consequently, we are less protected by the NRC radiation standards than the regulation of other toxic hazards by the EPA !</p> <p>In its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels. The purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety. If the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? If the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?</p> <p>Given that the NRC's present actions, it appears more invested in protecting/enabling the nuclear industry than safeguarding the well being of ordinary Americans re: nuclear energy and radiation exposures. This seemed especially true during the first six months of the Fukushima nuclear disaster, in which the NRC website issued no real or useful information about the fallout which came to our shores; rather, the information appeared to protect the image of the industry and downplay the out and out disaster of nuclear facilities run on the profit motive by a corporation. It is essential that the actions of the NRC receive intelligent review and regulation by our leaders, like yourself. Please-become better informed about the health risk to the public by peacetime radiation exposures in our own backyard. Thank You.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."</p>
59	Safety	External Stakeholder	<p>And there are far to many problems with San Onofre, in particular. It should not be re licensed. Evacuation proposals are not realistic. It's inherent reliability under potential environmental stress is not nearly sufficient for public safety. And the influence of the nuclear industry on decision making is unacceptable.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.</p>



## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
60	Safety and Security	External Stakeholder	<p>On Page 7, it defines nuclear safety with regards to public health, as just to "Prevent the occurrence of acute radiation exposures resulting in fatalities.", as though any other radiation exposure, short of fatalities is not their concern or of concern. This is completely unacceptable. Lower levels of radiation have long been know to cause all sorts of health problems, and they should be regulating to a higher degree than simply preventing fatalities.</p> <p>On Page 15, one of the security outcomes it to prevent public disclosure of safeguards. That seems to me to be counter productive, and not something that a this agency should be doing. It would make more sense if they publicly disclosed safeguards standards, and that those were designed to ensure security rather than trying to prevent them from being made public and making security through obscurity their practice (which is really not security).</p> <p>Anyway, I believe that nuclear materials bring us great benefits, but they are also extremely dangerous and need a greater than normal amount of regulation, control and concern. Understanding this, I hope you agree that this agency's priorities should be in protecting the health and safety of the public through regulating the usage of these materials.</p>	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
61	Openness	External Stakeholder	<p>Opportunities for public involvement and public input in NRC's licensing decisions should be improved by making the agency's website more user friendly. I was unable to access the federal rulemaking website recently by reference to the NRC docket number and missed the deadline for registering my comments on the NRC's draft guidance that would allow uranium recovery facilities to accept and process resins used to remove uranium from municipal water systems.</p>	These issues are addressed under Openness with greater detailed provided in the under "The NRC Approach to Open Government" on the NRC public Website.
62	Openness	External Stakeholder	<p>While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable. Where is the TRANSPARENCY officials keep promising?</p>	The agency's Near-Term Japan Task Force conducted a thorough review of all available information from the Fukushima-Daichii events and developed a comprehensive set of recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety. The staff is working towards the implementation of those recommendations.
63	Openness	OIS	<p>Pg. 16 – "<b>Openness:</b>" should read as, "The NRC increases openness by conducting its business in a transparent manner, enabling stakeholder participation, and enhancing collaboration with other Federal agencies, State, local, and Tribal governments, and international regulatory authorities."</p>	Comment accepted
64	Openness	OIS	<p>Pg. 16 – "<b>Collaboration:</b>" should read as, "Collaboration improves the effectiveness of government by encouraging partnerships and cooperation within the Federal government, with State, local, and Tribal governments, and with international regulatory authorities."</p>	Comment accepted
65	Openness	OIS	<p>Pg. 17 – for second bullet under "Transparency," change to read as, Increase public access to data that are collected or generated in the course of NRC activities and that are of significant interest to the public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Means—stakeholder consultation, publication at the NRC's public website and at <a href="http://www.data.gov">http://www.data.gov</a>.</li> </ul>	Comment accepted

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
66	Operational Excellence	OIS	<p>Pg. 23 – change narrative under “Information Management and Information Technology” to read as follows, “Manage information and employ technology to enhance information access and strengthen agency performance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Means—carry out a modernization program to streamline key business processes, reduce the number of legacy systems, standardize the application infrastructure, improve mobile and remote access, and complete work enabling secure information technology systems access through the use of the Government wide personal identity verification cards; enhance the information management program to ensure that information is available in a complete and timely manner and improve search capabilities.”</li> </ul>	Comment accepted
67	Planned Program Evaluations	NRC Employee	<p>Page 31:</p> <p><i>Corporate Support</i>  <i>Expected Completion Date: Annually</i>  <i>Objective: Each program evaluation will determine whether the corporate support services (e.g., administrative services, human capital management, financial management (including contract management), and information technology and information management) are being delivered consistent with the overall goals and whether internal and external customer needs and requirements are met.</i>  <i>Scope: The annual evaluation will be focused on one corporate support service area through a questionnaire, survey or checklist to determine: (1) did the program deliver the promised results, (2) customer satisfaction, (3) strengthen and weaknesses and (4) are staff resources adequately qualified.</i></p> <p>The objective seems to indicate that there would be 3 program evaluations (one each for the Operator Licensing Program, the ROP, and the IMPEP). Shouldn't the scope refer to “evaluations” or that an evaluation is done annually for each program? Otherwise it's a little confusing. Perhaps scope could be revised as follows:</p> <p><i>Scope: The annual evaluation for each planned program will be focused on one corporate support service area through a questionnaire, survey or checklist to determine: (1) did if the program delivered the promised results, (2) customer satisfaction, (3) strengthens and weaknesses and (4) are whether staff resources are adequately qualified. (And do we really need the word “resources” here? It just sounds a little awkward.)</i></p>	Comment not accepted; evaluations are set programs for evaluation of specific agency responsibilities as opposed to any for support functions.
68	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>One place to put a permanent storage bunker might be someplace in West Virginia already ruined by mountaintop removal coal mining in a 300 foot deep hole in the already ruined area and once the concrete bunker is made and filled with nuclear waste, dump the excavated dirt back on top of it. Appalachia is old enough and geologically stable enough, it might very well last the 3000 years you need to store it,</p>	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
69	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>No matter what big nuclear energy investors tell you, the NRC is NOT owned by them...! No wonder ordinary people are Occupying the Streets!!</p>	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
70	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>BTW (Steve) you are on the wrong side of the nuclear power issue, and those of us fighting against this wrong-headed human experiment will continue to point your position out to Huntington citizens. Please start to show some common sense. Cancer rates skyrocketed with nuclear testing in this country and continue to be high due to legally allowed releases. The inevitable accidents both large and small continue to damage and kill people world-wide.</p>	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
71	General Comment	External Stakeholder	We need to close all nuke plants and refocus our spending on alternative renewable sources to create new jobs and a safe future for US and everyone else!	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
72	General Comment	External Stakeholder	I AM ABSOLUTELY 100% <b>[EXPLETIVE DELETED]</b> ABOUT THIS GOVERNMENT'S INABILITY TO DO ANYTHING. WHY THE <b>[EXPLETIVE DELETED]</b> DON'T YOU ALL JUST GET THE <b>[EXPLETIVE DELETED]</b> OUT OF WASHINGTON? IT WOULD BE BETTER RUN WITHOUT YOU <b>[EXPLETIVE DELETED]</b> HYPOCRITES ANYWHERE NEAR THE CAPITOL!!! NO WONDER "OCCUPY" WILL CONTINUE TO GROW.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
73	General Comment	External Stakeholder	As an architect working on DoD projects I'm familiar with arguments promoting "clean" nuclear energy. What no one seems capable of answering are three simple questions: sustainable projects with timely results leading to jobs, jobs, jobs; what to do with planning and safety issues post-Fukushima; and the cost-analysis short & long term compared to developing alternative energy solutions. I know for a fact that we do not have the nuclear know-how to design & build right now and where they do the "state of the art" projects are still running way over budgets and schedules taking on average 12-14 years to construct. Nuclear is not an option.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
74	General Comment	External Stakeholder	I realize that you are somewhat pro-nuclear, but I also know that you are intelligent enough to know that the NRC is foolish to act in this irresponsible manner! Please do the right thing in preventing our NRC from minimizing their responsibilities to Americans in this manner!  Protecting the public is their duty and doing this fully, is what we demand!	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
75	General Comment	External Stakeholder	In the present day, it is true that we are faced with tremendous energy needs. We are also faced with a very sluggish economy that is need of a kickstart.  There are many who feel that this is an appropriate time for the resurgence of nuclear power. I believe that this is exactly the wrong path to pursue, considering the great costs of nuclear power. These costs range from the actual cost of construction, to the costs of maintenance, to the even large costs of safe transportation and storage of waste products, not to mention the instability of nuclear power in areas that have any kind of seismic activity.  Study after study have shown that nuclear power is very, very expensive. But more importantly, we all will pay a high price for the expansion of nuclear power. Alternatives to nuclear power are available. They are less costly and they steer our society in a safer, more economically and ecologically stable direction.  I implore you to consider the great cost of nuclear power expansion to our nation and our society. Our present technological knowledge does not make it safe or cost-efficient.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
76	General Comment	External Stakeholder	The purpose of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is to keep us safe from the very serious threat that nuclear power poses to a civilian consumer society. The risk is not worth taking the chance of meltdowns, explosions, and on-site waste deposition (due to no place else). The climate crisis is here and real--nuclear is incompatible with hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes, tsunamis, and the tectonic movements we are just beginning to undergo.  Tell the NRC to shut down nuclear plants that age out or destabilize with changing weather and global warming patterns.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
77	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>We cannot allow men to determine what women do with their bodies in terms of reproduction. Historically, religiously, and ethically, we have allowed men to determine the fate of our existence locally and globally and we have but to look around and see the pollution, the destruction; the deserts, the explosion of human population by the billions, and the horror unleashed on men by other men.</p> <p>Therefore, we, the people cannot continue to allow men to move forward on the mutually assured mental illness and dementia that personifies the majority of Congressional criminal politicians in every level of power possessing positions and control over every aspect of our lives, including the nuclear industry. On the micro level-it is unconscionable that democrats continue to imitate every aspect of republican tyranny towards the people/citizens and complete obedience to core capitalist interest from abortion to nuclear energy and unsustainable energy products with half-lives, that are destroying not only people but the air, water, and land as well. There has to be a moratorium what men can do to the world and its' people. Having so stated with all the conviction of a Martin Luther King, I implore you to, for once in your testosterone driven existence to think beyond your gender and actually put yourselves in the shoes of women, children, the planet, and of course powerful men who cannot shape lobbies or decision on their own and who rely on your representation to be moral, ethical, compassionate, and egalitarian. Therefore; I agree and I concur with the following scripted message regarding nuclear regulation. We must have green energy and it must begin today. Our planet cannot wait for corrupt politicians to determine our fate any longer. I am in full accord with the 99% and it is time for you to represent our interest and not the interest of the transnational corporate fascist who really run this government and use politicians like call girls; that have, are, and continue to screw their constituency. It is a new day and the disappointment I feel particularly with Durbin is making it possible that we will see another person in his place/office. We don't need democratic who are more republican than tea-party scum bags! The rise of electrical rates in Illinois and the monopoly on energy by this take over electrical company Ameren is the same corruption as Enron in California and it is an abomination, and wholly an egregious act of anti-trust violation...and I have heard not one of you say anything to prohibit this monopoly take over!:</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.</p>
78	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>Dear Rep. Shuler, Sen. Burr, and Sen. Hagan,</p> <p>We need a Nuclear Regulatory Commission that will implement post-Fukushima safety modifications, not to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels. The NRC's draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.</p> <p>Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.</p> <p>This is a matter of conflict of interest: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?</p> <p>For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. Please put people first!!</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."</p>

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
79	General Comment	External Stakeholder	The NRC is an industry puppet. It is co-option and corruption at the highest level of regulatory authority. The current NRC members must be replaced by NON-INDUSTRY-CONNECTED science professionals who understand the mission of the NRC--which is PRIMARILY to regulate nuclear operations for public health and safety, rather than to protect the financial and political interests of the industry it is supposed to be regulating.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
80	General Comment	External Stakeholder	Phasing out nuclear power generation in favor of truly sustainable technologies must be seen as deserving of consideration -- assuming the safe use of nuclear power generation if regulations are in place is not an assumption to be made ab initio.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
81	General Comment	External Stakeholder	THE NUCLEAR INDUSTRY IS NOT A SUSTAINABLE INDUSTRY. IT IS TOO EXPENSIVE TO BUILD NUCLEAR PLANTS, TO POLICE THEM, TO HANDLE THE WASTE FROM THEM. NUCLEAR ENERGY POISONS OUR GROUNDS, OUR WATERS. AND ACCIDENTS POISON ALL OF US AROUND THE WORLD.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
82	General Comment	External Stakeholder	This was a frightening wakeup call I received from NIRS. The NRC must, first and foremost, protect the American people and indeed, protect the world population from the dangers of nuclear energy production. The industry has had more than 40 years to perfect its technology to reduce risk and dispose of its waste but it can't do it! And nuclear power will never be produced without huge donations from the People's treasury! Do not permit any change to the purpose of the NRC. Its job is not now and never has been, to promote the use of nuclear power.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
83	General Comment	External Stakeholder	Our government has devoted our tax dollars to subsidize nuclear power AND made laws that absolve nuclear plant owners of any responsibility if nuclear catastrophe happens. The owners regularly ignore safety regulations to make more profit, and they have virtually no incentive to keep us safe.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
84	General Comment	External Stakeholder	WHEN ??? Will you lawyers / politicians ever take the health of the people and the planet before your greed. We all know how it works. Your masters tell you to do your work to scam the public and protect them so you keep getting that \$\$\$\$ off shore accounts. Fake patriots!	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
85	General Comment	External Stakeholder	The NRC is the classic 1% example of pathological sociopathy where life is irrelevant and profit is all - historically 1,000,000's have died from nuclear power from Chernobyl and now Fukushima - the cancers from Fukushima will show up in a few years - time enough for the Bpoehner's and the Faustian Bargainers to escalate the "DESTROYER OF THE WORLDS" (Oppenheimer KNEW!) Already people and children are saturated with radiation and uranium throughout our country and just because you will be the last man standing while the rest of us die, is diabolical.	The agency's Near-Term Japan Task Force conducted a thorough review of all available information from the Fukushima-Daichii events and developed a comprehensive set of recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety. The staff is working towards the implementation of those recommendations.

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
86	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>The people do not want nuclear power at all because whenever nuclear power is allowed to charge off its real costs to ratepayers, the electricity costs too much compared to alternatives. Nuclear power began with a mammoth deception saying it could produce power too cheap to meter. Now that everyone knows nuclear power has just cost Japan its healthy future, forever, it is clear no society can afford nuclear energy programs, not only because the electricity rates cost more but because the radioactivity destroys the entire nation surrounding these plants, which are scattered along the eastern seaboard of the US and in other heavily populated areas.</p> <p>Only by shutting down the entire industry and burying all the waste can societies guarantee their descendants a future in good health. We do not need the heavy costs of nuclear power and we must not permanently contaminate our nation as Japan has just done.</p> <p>The NRC should be accountable to the people not to industry. It is past time to bury the nuclear waste. Get the waste out of the cooling pools and into dry casks and then into underground repositories. Place these repositories in crystalline rock like granite and do not produce any more nuclear waste. Stop broadcasting US nuclear waste in Depleted Uranium munitions. You people holding office are the greatest frauds the world has ever known. You should look at your approval ratings and get a clue. You should be ashamed of the US nuclear weapons program and the use of DU weapons on civilian populations. The ongoing war crimes by the US come right out of the nuclear energy and weapons programs which should be shut down. We the people will remember how you in Congress betrayed us by promoting the great sin of nuclear contamination around the world. What other species goes so far out of its way to contaminate the one planet in space possible for our home and does it continually lying and trying to deceive the victims?</p> <p>Shut down the NRC if it has become nothing more than a tool of the nuclear industry. If you cannot serve the people and you deserve the low ratings of Congress, get your selves out of office and go find some honest employment or at least get off our payroll as you do not deserve a cent of our money and do not serve our interests.</p> <p>When is the NRC going to call for entombing Daiichi and stopping the enormous radioactive releases? That would be something worthy of doing instead of propping up this horrible, expensive and deadly nuclear industry.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.</p>
87	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety... not to protect the nuclear industry from financial bankruptcy and default.</p> <p>This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation?</p> <p>For FAR too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. This must stop. Now. We aren't going to just sit around while fools run the world into the ground.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."</p>

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
88	General Comment	External Stakeholder	Have you learned nothing from Japan? How can you want more nuclear power?	The agency's Near-Term Japan Task Force conducted a thorough review of all available information from the Fukushima-Daichii events and developed a comprehensive set of recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety. The staff is working towards the implementation of those recommendations.
89	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>The United States population has little faith in regulatory bodies these days, and actions like this give good reason. I have long joked that the NRC should be called the "Nuclear Romance Commission" after attending many meetings that clearly illustrated the cozy relationship between industry and regulators. Now, we see the NRC attempting to reemerge as a promoter of radioactive products, rather than a regulator. This is a dangerous conflict of interest that puts the public in grave danger.</p> <p>NRC: Regulate. That is what you are supposed to do. No more pandering to an industry that has proven nothing more than its allegiance to the bottom line. Just another corporation putting profits over people.</p> <p>Let's do the right thing and REGULATE this inherently dangerous industry. No more R &amp; D, no more subsidies, no more preemptive bailouts, loan guarantees, and CWIP. The nuke lovers have bled us dry and its time to end it.</p>	The Principles of Good Regulation Statement now reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."
90	General Comment	External Stakeholder	Japan's Atomic Energy Commission reports (today) that it will take 30 years to shut down the Fukashima Daichai plant. People will slowly and painfully die for years and years. If you vote for continued nuclear power, you are liable to your Maker for maiming and killing people. You must stop this now.	The agency's Near-Term Japan Task Force conducted a thorough review of all available information from the Fukushima-Daichii events and developed a comprehensive set of recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety. The staff is working towards the implementation of those recommendations.
91	General Comment	External Stakeholder	Now. Are you going to keep voting the opposite way your people , we the people want you to vote??? nuclear will be the death of this planet. duh	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
92	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>Our concerns about the country's energy needs should not result in less stringent agency policies for an industry with serious safety issues.</p> <p>Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety. The DOE is the agency charged with promoting nuclear energy. One such agency is plenty.</p> <p>Also, for too long, the government has continued to devote our increasingly scarce resources in support of nuclear power, when equal support of renewable energy would result in net energy increases much more quickly than nuclear power could ever hope to deliver.</p> <p>I urge you to insist that the "enable" language in NRC's Strategic Plan be removed. But even more than that, I ask that you replace support for nuclear power, with support for renewable energy in its many forms.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."</p>
93	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>The nuclear industry has depended on U.S. taxpayers since its beginnings in 1939. To this day, despite assurances about how safe nuclear power is, nuclear reactors cannot obtain private insurance. This is because an accident at a single nuclear facility could cost hundreds of billions, if not trillions, of dollars in damage, as a recent European study found, and as we have seen at Fukushima.</p> <p>After almost 3/4 of a century, there is no acceptable disposal option for nuclear waste, much of which will remain highly toxic for millennia.</p> <p>It's time to let the nuclear industry pay for itself. It probably cannot, and its demise would bring a cleaner planet and healthier inhabitants.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.</p>
94	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>HUMAN RIGHTS FIRST, NOT THE BUCK IN YOUR POCKETS CORPORATE <b>[EXPLETIVE DELETED]</b>. GOT CHRISTIAN?????</p>	<p>The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.</p>
95	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>Please read the article in the Wall Street Journal published today about the issues facing Japan's clean up efforts after their nuclear accident. Can we really afford a similar fate in the US (isn't the deficit large enough)? Can you honestly tell your state that we have plans in place to prevent a similar accident, or even worse some accident that we haven't anticipated? Do you honestly believe that we have plans in place to recover from such a disaster? Clearly nuclear power isn't as safe as we've all been lead to believe. Clearly any accident will become the burden of the citizens and not the company who causes the accident.</p> <p>Consider how history proves that greed is king and safety takes a back seat when money is involved. All we need to do is look at the gulf oil spill, the Exxon Valdez, the drug companies with their leathal drugs to see that safety is a secondary consideration when it comes to making a buck.</p> <p>Japan lacked the political will to put good effective regulations in place to protect their citizens. They now face billions of dollars of clean up and untold health issues for the poor people who live near the reactors. Please show us that you have the political will to make good choices that protect the citizens of the state of Idaho and our country.</p>	<p>The agency's Near-Term Japan Task Force conducted a thorough review of all available information from the Fukushima-Daichii events and developed a comprehensive set of recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety. The staff is working towards the implementation of those recommendations.</p>



## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
96	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>In reality, NRC was created by Congress to rectify the promotional abuses of the AEC. And so, in 1974 Congress intent for NRC regulations was to protect the public health and safety and internalize all the costs of nuclear power including waste management in perpetuity, not simply to enable nuclear power plants, as had been AEC's practice.</p> <p>This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then the agency is in a conflict of interest position, much as its predecessor, and it is unlikely to shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be.</p> <p>For too long, our special interest controlled government has been putting the interests and profits of large corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities bottom line ahead of public safety and the public's majority desire for clean energy.. This must stop. Now.</p> <p>On a related matter, the President's Blue Ribbon Commission seeks to establish more nuclear power and reprocessing by offering an "incentive" (bribe) program to entice communities to offer themselves as (both interim and permanent) repository sites and take the vast amounts of HLW already sitting in dangerously crowded storage at nuclear plants around the country. NYS's experience with LLRW siting in the 1990s - notably in Allegheny County - is clearly a lesson that Washington has not taken seriously. The BRC has largely ignored the important legacy issues here in NY: the failed West Valley commercial reprocessing venture, the Niagara Falls Storage Site, the Tonawanda Site, Colonie, etc.</p> <p>It's NRC's and DOE's job to learn these lessons and to properly address all the legacy wastes before any new nuclear power enterprises are advanced. That has not happened.</p> <p>It's fairly obvious that the White House is in bed with the nuclear industry. I will vote accordingly in 2012</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."</p>
97	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>The days of nuclear energy will end as soon as our tax dollars stop funding reactors and disposal sites. They are no longer profitable in any way which is why speculators won't invest in them. Now we the tax payers are forced to support this dying filthy dangerous monster called nuclear energy. It is just a matter of how much health damage we will all be subjected to while they die out, will we be another Japan? Murphys law says YES ,DEFINITELY and anyone w/ a half a brain can figure this out. This industry is nothing more than a group of mafia like thugs stealing money from the public when our dollars should be going to wind,solar energy,IT IS AN OUTRAGE! How dare this govt. continue to put us all in the highest form of danger against our will!</p>	<p>The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.</p>
98	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION IS SUPPOSED TO BE THE WATCHDOG OVER NUCLEAR POWER - NOT THE ENABLER OF NUCLEAR POWER.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."</p>

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
99	General Comment	External Stakeholder	So they get to promote what may be a possibly dangerous nuclear agenda?	The Principles of Good Regulation Statement now reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."
100	General Comment	External Stakeholder	Actually, the entire nuclear energy program was designed to put lipstick on the pig of ongoing nuclear weapons development.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
101	General Comment	External Stakeholder	Get away from nuclear power and move solidly toward a nuclear-free and a carbon-free energy system. Get going on it Now.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
102	General Comment	External Stakeholder	Colorado already has nuclear waste that has not been handled properly.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
103	General Comment	External Stakeholder	I used to be completely against nuclear power but then I looked at France. They use nuclear power extensively in France with seemingly little health consequences. So I've changed my mind about nuclear power being 100% bad news. But the radioactive waste is very bad news. We must find a way to recycle the radioactive by-products of nuclear power.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
104	General Comment	External Stakeholder	I was arrested in front of Diablo in 1978 because PG&E did not know what they would do with their terrible nuclear waste---they still DO NOT KNOW----storage on site is NOT acceptable.  The NRC is dragging its feet. This has meant putting nuclear utilities ahead of people. Store Diablo's nuclear waste in the backyards of PG&E's CEOs----not upwind to where I live.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
105	General Comment	External Stakeholder	Since there is no solution to protect the public from uncontainable radioactive fuel and waste, all nuclear plants must be shut down and the radioactive materials contained as safely as possible to protect our next generations far into the future.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
106	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>REGULATION requires independent evaluation, where representatives of those agencies DO NOT DEPEND on the very industry they are regulating for livelihood...we have a SERIOUS problem in the US. PUBLIC SAFETY AND WELL BEING HAVE BEEN LOST TO CORPORATE PROFITS. I demand an immediate STOP to all unsafe industries...OUR INVESTMENT MUST BE IN SUSTAINABLE ENERGY NO MORE DRILLING, NO MORE NUCLEAR..NO MORE WIRELESS..ALL THESE TECHNOLOGIES ARE KILLING HUMANS, OUR CITIZENS AND OUR GOVERNMENT IS SUPPORTING IT! Who is liable to the people...we are being fed toxic food, given toxic medicines, denied the truth of Fukushima fall out, and constantly now in the microwave soup of wireless radiation...DEATH DUE TO CANCER, TUMOR GROWTH, NEUROLOGICAL DECLINE, DEMENTIA LIES AROUND THE CORNER...LIFE SPAN IS ALREADY DECLINING...WHEN WILL OUR REPRESENTATIVES SHOW ANY COMPASSION AND CARE...</p> <p>IF NOTHING IS DONE, SEND THEM HOME...NO MORE LIES! We might as well call it like it is, they are not representatives...they are corporate cronies...prostitutes selling themselves to the highest bidder...DEMOCRACY IS DEAD, TYRANNY REIGNS IN WASHINGTON...TYRANNY OF THE DOLLAR, OF CORP. GREED...where are the ethics in politics? I VOTE TO OCCUPY THE WHITE HOUSE, OCCUPY CONGRESS, SEND THEM ALL HOME!</p>	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
107	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>I SEE THERE ARE NO WORKING BRAINS, NO INTELLIGENCE IN CONGRESS, IN THE GOVERNMENT!!!! NUKE POWER IS NOT SAFE, THERE IS NO PLACE TO PUT THE WASTE, AND LOOK AT THE DESTRUCTION FROM THE JAPAN PROBLEM. IT TAKES MILLIONS OF YEARS TO GET OVER A NUKE POSIONING!!! WE ARE ALREADY ON THE ROAD TO DESTRUCTION, SO MUCH OF THE SOIL OF THE WORLD IS ALREADY POISONED WITH CHEMICALS, NUKE, AND OTHER POISONS THAT ARE IN THE AIR, WATER, SOIL, WHICH FOOD GROWS IN, AND ANIMALS THAT ARE CONSUMED EAT AND PASS ON TO HUMANS. AIR, WATER, AND FOOD ARE ESSENTIAL FOR ALL LIVING SPECIES TO HAVE IN ORDER TO LIVE--HUMANS TOO, AND ALL THE DRUGS HUMANS MAY CREATE WILL NOT, CAN NOT, DO ANYTHING TO REMEDY THE POISONING, AND THE DRUGS DO MORE DAMAGE THAN GOOD ANYWAY!!!!</p>	The agency's Near-Term Japan Task Force conducted a thorough review of all available information from the Fukushima-Daichii events and developed a comprehensive set of recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety. The staff is working towards the implementation of those recommendations.
108	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>We have far too many rogue agencies and this one is absolutely the worst. It does NOT provide for safe energy and is NOT in the best interest of the people of the United States. Do NOT support any type of Nuclear energy programs with my tax dollars.</p> <p>Alternatives is the smart, clean, safe way to go with NO storage problems with the waste. How can we waste sunshine? Answer: By NOT using it for more than just growing children and food!!!! That's how!</p>	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
109	General Comment	External Stakeholder	Nuclear power is not clean and is not safe!	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
110	General Comment	External Stakeholder	For too long, the government has been putting the collusive nuclear weapons industry interests and profits of large energy/defense corporations ahead of the public's safety and impassioned stated interests. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting nuclear utilities/weapons corps ahead of actual, real, bonafide people (the biological persons who have always been so, before corporations were granted such titles.) This must stop. Now.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
111	General Comment	External Stakeholder	In the alternative, all spent nuclear material must be disposed of on the property those in favor of expanding nuclear facilities live, and moved to any new residence that they may move to in the future!!!	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
112	General Comment	External Stakeholder	(That's correct!! Nuclear fuel, processing, and waste constitute some of the most toxic substances in existence, and even in tiny amounts. The infiltration of nuclear materials in the environment is extremely easy to occur. We are witnessing the decline of Japan due to the Fukushima disaster, as a result of human negligence and greed, and the unpredictability of natural events-- as opposed to the hubris of so-called 'safety experts.' The NRC should be reconstituted, far away from the cozy inbreeding with nuclear power operators that currently exists in its daily business.)	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
113	General Comment	External Stakeholder	Start shutting down all the nuclear power plants. We know they are not safe and it is time to develop alternatives such as solar, wind and geothermal power. No more nukes! None!	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
114	General Comment	External Stakeholder	I grew up under threat of nuclear bombs and now my children are under threat from nuclear reactors, nobody wants this except those few individuals making money from this, let's wake up!!!	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
115	General Comment	External Stakeholder	WE, THE PEOPLE, DESERVE A SAFE ENVIRONMENT & THAT DOES NOT INCLUDE NUCLEAR POWER. YOU KNOW IN YOUR HEART OF HEARTS IT IS GOING TO RUIN OUR WORLD. PLEASE DO WHAT IS RIGHT FOR THE PEOPLE THIS TIME.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
116	General Comment	External Stakeholder	I live near an earthquake fault line. If my parents and other activists had not stopped the construction of the Bodega Head nuclear plant in the sixties, I would also be living near a nuclear plant that was near a fault line.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
117	General Comment	External Stakeholder	YES, JUST ANOTHER BUNCH OF OPPORTUNISTS THAT ARE TOO STUPID, TO MONEY MOTIVATED,, TO DO A RESPONSIBLE AND PROPER JOB. GOD KNOWS THIS SOUNDS LIKE WASHINGTON DC DOES IT NOT !!!!!	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
118	General Comment	External Stakeholder	While the NRC is dragging its feet implementing needed post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is unacceptable, ridiculous, akin to the "we had to destroy the village to save it" mentality which did us so much good in Vietnam only here we're playing with nuclear materials!	The agency's Near-Term Japan Task Force conducted a thorough review of all available information from the Fukushima-Daichi events and developed a comprehensive set of recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety. The staff is working towards the implementation of those recommendations.
119	General Comment	External Stakeholder	We have no way to safely dispose of nuclear waste. That should be enough reason to not use nuclear power for anything!!!	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
120	General Comment	External Stakeholder	Nuclear power is highly dangerous: from the mining, to the processing, to the generation of power, and to the disposal of waste. NRC's regulations are to protect public health and safety not to enable the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.	The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
121	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>I notice that there is no discussion in the NRC's draft strategic plan about the testing of plutonium fuel (MOX) made from weapons-grade plutonium that will be required for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to license MOX use in boiling water reactors (BWRs) and which will be needed to license MOX use for three cycles in pressurized water reactors (PWRs). I believe this issue and problems associated with it are worthy of mention in the strategic plan, as preparations for this test may well begin by 2016.</p> <p>Given that the U.S. Department of Energy is considering MOX use in the Tennessee Valley Authority's Browns Ferry reactors (GE Mark I BWRs) and Energy Northwest's Columbia Generating Station (GE Mark II BWR) as well as in TVA's Sequoyah PWRs (ice condenser design, with thin containment), the NRC will be intimately involved in the licensing of these tests and subsequently in any licensing of batch use if such a license request goes forward. A discussion of the task in front of the NRC to license the MOX tests is worthy of discussion in the plan and though no request are now before the NRC construction of the MOX plant at the DOE's Savannah River Site implies such requests if the facility is finished and can operate per NRC license requirements.</p> <p>As there has been no testing at all of weapons-grade MOX in BWRs - a fact which some in the plutonium industry have attempted to cloud - a test for a full three 2-year fuel cycles will be necessary to license MOX for three cycles of irradiation. After the irradiation, the NRC will have to be involved in post irradiation examination, if it is decided to review the results of any test that might take place.</p> <p>Likewise, in order to license MOX for three 18-month cycles in the Sequoyah PWRs, a three-cycle test will be necessary. As a test of weapons-grade MOX was aborted in Duke Energy's Catawba reactor after only two cycles in which the fuel assemblies did not perform as planned, a successful third cycle of MOX assemblies will be necessary if MOX will be used for the normal three cycles for uranium fuel.</p> <p>Obviously, there may be decisions not to proceed with MOX use given exorbitant costs of the program, proliferation implications associated with introducing plutonium into commerce, the stresses it places on reactor operation and given the more serious radiation release in case of an accident involving containment breach.</p> <p>While the licensing review of the MOX plant under construction at the DOE's Savannah River Site is mentioned in the draft plan, it must be noted that operation of the plant, if it were to receive an operating license, will be curtailed during testing of weapons-grade MOX in BWRs and PWRs. As the MOX plant is at risk of sitting idle or operating at reduced capacity after initial fabrication of the MOX "lead test assemblies" (LTAs), the NRC must take this into account as it considers the operating license. The SRS MOX plant will be, if completed and if operable, the only place in the world which could be available to fabricate MOX fuel from weapons-grade plutonium, so the only option will be that the LTAs be fabricated there. Fabrication of the LTAs could only take place after successful start-up of the MOX plant and production of batch quantities of fuel will likely not be able to proceed given the necessity of lengthy NRC-licensed MOX testing in a BWR and a PWR, which will have unknown results. Lacking licensing confirmation of batch MOX use at the time of initial operation of the MOX plant dictates that no production can take place until multi-year testing of LTAs has fully concluded. That the MOX plant may sit idle or will operate at reduced capacity needs to be considered during licensing review of the facility.</p> <p>I request that this comment be made a part of the official record and that it also be placed in ADAMS.</p>	Comment not accepted; the NRC's annual Performance Budget and Performance Reports provide more detail.

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
122	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>It was most distressing to learn today that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is seeking to change its mission from protecting the public health and safety to enabling the use of radioactive materials. How much have nuclear industry lobbyists been paying off members of the NRC? Please stop the NRC from making such a change in its mission. Please also make it implement needed post-Fukushima safety modifications to reactors and improvements to monitoring, control, and emergency response processes.</p> <p>Time is of the essence because the NRC is moving ahead with attempts to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels. This is unacceptable. The purpose of NRC regulations must remain "to protect the public health and safety."</p>	The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence
123	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels.</p> <p>Consider the madness: to let those who can't even regulate get the option to enable !!!!!</p> <p>Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety.</p> <p>( This is an internal NRC joke )</p>	The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence
124	General Comment	External Stakeholder	GET US OFF THE NUCLEAR ENEGY BANDWAGON!	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
125	General Comment	External Stakeholder	<p>Radioisotopes are poisons that spread throughout the environment and cause cancers and other organ diseases as well as genetic malformations in babies. The results of Chernobyl were as horrific as the lies told about it by organizations that refuse to acknowledge the human devastation. Foremost among them the IAEA has blocked investigations into radioactive poisoning, specifically the WHO study of 1995 which was blocked from publishing its findings.</p> <p>Nuclear power is immoral in the extreme and hazardous to all of us. It needs to be abolished immediately and replaced by clean renewable technologies. Geothermal heat mining is the most promising of these, and mines the earth's unlimited heat to produce electricity. Look it up.</p>	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
126	General Comment	External Stakeholder	Like other pseudoregulatory agencies, NRC are in bed with corporate interests, as are the Wyoming Triplets. You will gladly bend over as your corporate masters slide into you. There're a reasons the pro-nuke bastards cannot get private funding: nuclear power is too dangerous and the costs of cleanup far exceed any expected returns on investment, including insurance investments. Tell the nuclear interests to <b>[EXPLETIVE DELETED]</b> off.	The comment is unrelated to the update of the NRC's Strategic Plan.
127	Mission	NRC Employee	On page 5, Mission, suggest that byproduct, source, and special nuclear material be defined either in footnote or in Glossary since most the general public doesn't know what theses terms mean.	Comment accepted

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
128	Mission	NRC Employee	<p>According to the NRC's public website (<a href="http://www.nrc.gov/about-nrc.html">http://www.nrc.gov/about-nrc.html</a>) the NRC's mission is, "To <b>regulate</b> the nation's civilian use of byproduct, source, and special nuclear materials to ensure adequate protection of public health and safety, to promote the common defense and security, and protect the environment."</p> <p>Whereas the Strategic Plan states (see page 5), "The mission of the NRC is to <b>license and regulate</b> the Nation's civilian use of byproduct, source, and special nuclear materials in order to ensure the adequate protection of public health and safety, promote the common defense and security, and protect the environment."</p> <p>My comment is that the mission statement in the NRC's Strategic Plan and public website should be made consistent. My suggestion is to add the words "license and" before the word "regulate" in the mission statement on the NRC's public website to make it consistent with the Strategic Plan.</p>	Comment acknowledged; change to be made to NRC website.
129	Mission	External Stakeholder	<p>In 1974, the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) was disbanded by Congress, because it had the dual and conflicting mission of both promoting and regulating nuclear power. It's not possible to do both.</p> <p>The promotional side of the AEC was moved to the Energy Research and Development Administration (which later became the Department of Energy). The NRC was created to fulfill the regulatory mission. It is NOT its purpose to 'enable'.</p>	The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."
130	Mission	External Stakeholder	The purpose of regulatory agencies is to PROTECT PEOPLE FROM INDUSTRY AND GOVERNMENT, not the other way around. NRC, please do your job! After Fukushima, we need to start moving away from nuclear power, not enabling their further development.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
131	Mission	External Stakeholder	I am writing about a very serious matter that I sincerely hope you will please pay attention to - the NRC is trying to pull a 'fast one' by sematically altering the mission of their agency -to perpetuate the proliferation of nuclear materials - forever!	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
132	Mission	External Stakeholder	<p>I am very concerned about some of the wording in the mission statement of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's new strategic plan.</p> <p>Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the safe &amp; secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels. The specific wording is:          "Principles of Good Regulation          The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is enabled by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability. In addition, regulatory actions are effective, realistic, and timely."</p> <p>The word "enable" is a very poor choice (even if it's meant to modify "safe and secure use.") A far better choice of wording would be "enforce" safe and secure use. That's what being a regulatory commission means.</p>	The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
133	Mission	External Stakeholder	The NRC was created in 1974, its purpose was to fulfill a regulatory mission. The DOE is supposed to do the "enabling". NRC stands for "Nuclear Regulatory Commission", not "Nuclear Enabling Commission".	The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."
134	Mission	External Stakeholder	The NRC needs to have its promotional and enabling functions separated from its regulatory ones.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
135	Mission	External Stakeholder	<p>It appears to me that the NRC has taken over the mandate of the AEC "to ensure public health and safety from the hazards of nuclear power (but) without imposing excessive requirements that would inhibit the growth of the industry."</p> <p>Also, it should be noted that part of the Mission Statement of the NRC is "to provide for the common defense." What does the common defense have to do with civilian nuclear power? The common defense can only refer to nuclear weaponry. The U.S. still has 5,000 nuclear warheads. Some 1,800 of them are targeted on the Soviet Union...oooops Russia....ready to be launched at a moment's notice.</p> <p>A coalition of anti-VY groups just had a rally (10.30) at the gates of VY. I counted 200 young and old from VT., N.H., and Mass. I'd say all want VY to close ASAP.</p>	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
136	Mission	External Stakeholder	We want the NRC to protect the public and the environment, not promote and enable the industry it regulates.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
137	Mission	External Stakeholder	<p>Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels: THIS IS A FALSEHOOD.</p> <p>Actually, the PURPOSE OF NRC REGULATIONS IS TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY, NOT TO TOADY UP TO CORPORATE OWNERS.</p>	The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."
138	Mission	External Stakeholder	If the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect public health and safety, the NRC should NOT be committed to protecting the interest of its use as a power source! They should function as an objective "outsider". There are far too many public health dangers and safety liabilities in fueling nuclear power plants and disposing of radioactive waste for the NRC to allow continuation of the industry. If the NRC was functioning as they are suppose to be, they would weigh on the side of the public interest.	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.



## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
139	Mission	External Stakeholder	I BELIEVE THE NRC SHOULD WORK TO PROTECT HUMANS AND OUR ECOSYSTEMS, NOT "ENABLE" UTILITIES IN THEIR MISSION TO PRODUCE ENERGY AT THE HIGHEST PROFIT WITH NO REGARD TO SUSTAINABLE PRACTICES.	The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence
140	Mission	External Stakeholder	<p>It is very disturbing to learn that instead of assessing the dangers to public health and life itself demonstrated by the Fukushima accident, the 3-Mile Island crisis, the Chernobyl tragedy, the NRC is proposing to redefine the purpose of nuclear regulation.</p> <p>In its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels. This is what the industry wants but it is NOT what the US public, we taxpayers, want from the NRC. We want regulation and protection, not the facilitation of profits for the nuclear industry.</p> <p>NRC regulations are to protect the public health and safety.</p> <p>Members of the NRC must removed if they are so mistaken about what their purpose is.</p>	The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence
141	Mission	External Stakeholder	<p>I am writing to express my outrage that the NRC is attempting to turn its mission from one of protecting the people from the dangers of radiation to one of promoting the nuclear industries.</p> <p>As a scientist with knowledge of the dangers of radiation, especially the internal radiation so often neglected in news reports, I am appalled by the horror story going on in Japan and by the realization that nuclear plants in the US are "sitting ducks," ripe for similar catastrophic crises.</p> <p>The main role of the NRC, protecting the population from nuclear plants of every kind, is being distorted before our very eyes. Attention should be placed on the phased decommissioning of all nuclear plants and storage of wastes in the safest manner possible. Unless the money involved has removed all semblance of rationality, how else could members of this comission consider going forward with business as usual? Sheer insanity!</p>	The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.
142	Mission	External Stakeholder	The NRC's proposed post-Fukushima redefinition of the very principles of nuclear regulation is shameful.	The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."
143	Mission	External Stakeholder	The NRC is apparently attempting to redefine the principles of nuclear regulation from citizen protection to enabling. This is unacceptable.	The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
144	Mission	External Stakeholder	<p>I am writing to express my outrage that the NRC is attempting to turn its mission from one of protecting the people from the dangers of radiation to one of promoting the nuclear industries.</p> <p>As a scientist with knowledge of the dangers of radiation, especially the internal radiation so often neglected in news reports, I am appalled by the horror story going on in Japan and by the realization that nuclear plants in the US are "sitting ducks," ripe for similar catastrophic crises.</p> <p>The main role of the NRC, protecting the population from nuclear plants of every kind, is being distorted before our very eyes. Attention should be placed on the phased decommissioning of all nuclear plants and storage of wastes in the safest manner possible. Unless the money involved has removed all semblance of rationality, how else could members of this commission consider going forward with business as usual? Sheer insanity!</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan emphasizes the NRC's continued mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.</p>
145	Mission	External Stakeholder	<p>I am a Professor of physics and astronomy and the natural sciences at Carleton College and an analyst of energy issues.</p> <p>I am very concerned that the NRC draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels. I thought the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety. Isn't this why the NRC was split off from the AEC? Isn't this why there is an "R" in NRC?</p> <p>I hope you will urge the NRC to go back to its main mission of protecting our health and safety. This is particularly relevant in Minnesota, with a GE Mark I reactor upwind from the Twin Cities.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."</p>
146	Mission	External Stakeholder	<p>The NRC must not be allowed to redefine its mission on a spurious basis - certainly not in a time of post Fukushima radiation crisis. Even as it is dragging its feet on post-Fukushima safety modifications, it is also trying to redefine the very principles of nuclear regulation. This is completely unacceptable.</p> <p>In the draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels; however, the purpose of NRC regulations is, in fact, to protect the public health and safety. This should invalidate the draft from the start as it is conflict with enabling legislation.</p> <p>The function of shutting down a reactor that is dangerous would be contravened by such wording, and is antithetical to what the nation needs from the NRC.</p> <p>People are in the streets all over the country because they are fed up with either corporations, or the collusion between regulatory agencies in our government and corporations. In WWII it was called fascism. Now we don't care what it's called, we just want it to stop before we all have cancer. And who was talking about lowering medical costs?</p> <p>All our agencies with oversight are mutating into foxes guarding the henhouse...is this a genetic mutation caused by radiation? (joke). Let's get our agencies to do the work they were meant to do: protect the citizens of the United States (who own the country, in fact, though K St seems to have forgotten.)</p> <p>Thanks in advance - I have no choice but to trust your higher principles.</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."</p>

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
147	Mission	External Stakeholder	<p>Specifically, in its draft Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, the NRC says, on page 5, that the purpose of its regulations is to "enable" the use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels. This is clearly NOT the NRC mandate! Nuclear fuels and radioactive materials have to be carefully disposed of, not "used"!</p> <p>Actually, the purpose of NRC regulations is to protect the public health and safety; not to make profits for corrupt and fascist corporations!</p> <p>This is more than just semantics: if the purpose of NRC regulation is to enable use of nuclear power, then how could the agency ever shut down a nuclear reactor, no matter how dangerous it might be? Indian Point, for example, must be shut down! The place is completely unsafe sitting on an earthquake zone! When will Fukushima get through your thick skulls!</p> <p>And given this language, if the NRC ever did try to do that, would a utility be able to sue the agency for preventing, rather than enabling, a reactor's operation? This is insane! The people proposing this should be hospitalized on a psych ward.</p> <p>For too long, the government has been putting the interests and profits of large corrupt and fascist corporations ahead of the public's interest. In the NRC's case, this has meant putting corrupt and fascist nuclear utilities, like Entergy, ahead of people. This must stop. Now. Death to the corrupt and fascist corporatocracy! Jail the thieving suits!</p>	<p>The updated Strategic Plan reads: "The safe and secure use of radioactive materials and nuclear fuels for beneficial civilian purposes is made possible by the agency's adherence to the following principles of good regulation: independence, openness, efficiency, clarity, and reliability."</p>
148	Mission and Strategic Objectives	NRC Employee	<p>The safety-goal strategic outcomes (see page 7) give the impression that the NRC only desires to prevent radiological hazards of licensed materials. It should be noted that we desire to prevent exposures to hazardous chemicals used with, or produced from, licensed material.</p> <p>My suggestion is to add a footnote to the third and fourth safety-goal strategic outcomes that reads, "For fuel cycle facilities, this extends to hazardous chemicals used with, or produced from, radioactive material consistent with 10 CFR Part 70 and proposed amendments to 10 CFR Part 40."</p>	<p>Comment not accepted – chemical safety is not a strategic-level concern of the NRC.</p>

## Updated FY 2008-2013 Strategic Plan Comment Resolution Matrix

No.	Category	Commenter	Comment	Disposition
149	Mission and Strategic Objectives	NRC Employee	<p>As this strategic plan claimed, the agency's mission and strategic objectives remain unchanged throughout FY2016. However, we all have realized how quickly the world is changing with the now ubiquitously present smartphones, tablets, mobile devices. I would like to suggest that our strategy plan to include considering enhancing communications with our mobile staff, stakeholders, and public from anywhere, at any time, via a vast variety of ways. Exploring how to adopt innovative technologies and best practices and leverage the commercial industry to meet the needs carrying out the NRC mission more effectively, efficiently, and of course, affordably.</p> <p>Sample areas may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NRC Mobile Application:</b> Leverage the rapid advances in COTS smartphone technology that have changed the game for creating custom, multi-platform applications that can dramatically boost our communications to reach out.</li> <li>• <b>Disaster Recovery and Emergency Response:</b> Figure out how to best use new commercial wireless technologies in our first response, disaster response, and Continuity of Operations (COOP) plans.</li> <li>• <b>Federal-Grade Mobile Security:</b> information assurance for wireless voice communications, mobile printing, encrypt documentation and emails, end-point protection of computer virus etc.</li> </ul>	<p>Comment not accepted – the Information Technology/ Information Management Strategic Plan covers this level of detail.</p>