[**Beyond Nuclear 2 Parent**]

From: jim yarbrough [jyarbro2003@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2016 8:48 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Nuclear waste

Stop making it(nuclear waste). The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.

Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks.

Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.

Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, not to so-called centralized interim storage (de facto permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).

Geological repositories must be scientifically suitable (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), socially acceptable (genuinely consent-based), and environmentally just. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open any repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.

Do not reprocess (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk nuclear weapons proliferation, and be astronomically expensive; it would also very likely cause environmental ruin downwind and downstream of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.

Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit emptied of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.

Carefully pass information about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship" described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.

Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.

Environmental justice, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.

Thank you. Jim Yarbrough South Pasadena, CA 91030

From: Judy Allen [judya814@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2016 5:46 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: No, no, a thousand times NO!

Importance: High

To the Department of Energy:

I do not consent to your plan to open one or more centralized interim storage sites for high-level radioactive waste.

I do not consent to your plan to continue using nuclear energy as a viable solution to anything. The nuclear age is over. You are the Department of ENERGY. It's time your agency embraces renewables as the ONLY viable power source we need along with energy efficiency and conservation. If our taxes pay your salaries, you are responsible to US, the taxpayers, not the coal, gas, oil and nuclear industries that have had you over a barrel for decades.

Here is the plan you need to follow about radioactive waste:

Stop making it. The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.

Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed “wet” storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks.

Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.

Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, not to so-called centralized interim storage (de facto permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).

Geological repositories must be scientifically suitable (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore),socially acceptable (genuinely consent-based), and environmentally just. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can’t open any repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century afterEnrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world’s first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first “civilian” atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.Do not reprocess (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk nuclear weapons proliferation, and be astronomically expensive; it would also very likely cause environmental ruin downwind and downstream of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.

Preserve and maintain “wet” storage pools – albeit emptied of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.

Carefully pass information about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, from one generation to the next, à la the concept of “Rolling Stewardship” described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.

Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.

Environmental justice, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.

I live 14 miles from the failing, leaking, old and decrepit Indian Point Energy Center in Buchanan, NY. Spectra's Algonquin Pipeline has been constructed to run 105 feet from essential safety and security structures at Indian Point. Who is minding the store? What kool-aid are you all drinking to have let this happen in the first place?

So to reiterate: NO, I DO NOT CONSENT to mobile Chernobyls through Putnam County, or to de facto permanent parking lot dumps for high-level radioactive waste, or to permanent burial dumps for high-level radioactive waste on scientifically unsuitable, socially unacceptable, and/or environmentally unjust (radioactively racist) locations.

Thank you for your consideration.

Judy Allen
24 Seifert Lane
Putnam Valley, NY 10579

From: Judi Angell [jangell@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2016 3:10 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: To reiterate the most frequent public comments content omitted from your recent summary==We Do Not Consent!

re: Irradiated Nuclear Fuel (High-Level Radioactive Waste)

1. **Stop making it.** The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
2. **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
3. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
4. Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), **transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
5. **Geological repositories** must be **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), **socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.
6. **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.
7. **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers**, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.
8. **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.
9. **Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste**. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be

required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.

10. **Environmental justice**, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.**

J. Angell

From: :- p [parzival1@inbox.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2016 8:04 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Comments on the draft report

Hello, my name is Patrick Annabel.

I am submitting comments to the DOE concerning 'Consent Based Siting' of radioactive waste dumps, or "centralized interim storage sites" and permanent burial dumps for high-level radioactive waste/irradiated nuclear fuel. My comments touch on ten key points.

1.Stop making it. The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.

2.Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks.

3.Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.

4..Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, not to so-called centralized interim storage (de facto permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).

5.Geological repositories must be scientifically suitable (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), socially acceptable (genuinely

consent-based), and environmentally just. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open any repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.

6.Do not reprocess (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk nuclear weapons proliferation, and be astronomically expensive; it would also very likely cause environmental ruin downwind and downstream of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.

7.Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit emptied of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back-up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.

8.Carefully pass information about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship" described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.

9.Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.

10.Environmental justice, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my comments.

Sincerely,

Patrick Annabel
818 E. Chestnut St.
Walla Walla, WA. 99362.

From: Patrick [bosolds@lisco.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2016 5:29 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
CC: bosolds@lisco.com
Subject: Citizen comment on DOE plans for Irradiated Nuclear Fuel (High-Level Radioactive Waste), "Consent-Based Siting"

Dear Dept. of Energy public comments team,

This is a citizen comment on DOE plans for Irradiated Nuclear Fuel (High-Level Radioactive Waste), and Consent-Based Siting.

1. **Stop making it.** The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
2. **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
3. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
4. Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), **transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
5. **Geological repositories** must be **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), **socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.
6. **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.
7. **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers**, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.
8. **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.
9. **Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste**. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.
10. **Environmental justice**, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color**

communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.

Sincerely,

Patrick Bosold
202 N. 5th St.
Fairfield, IA 52556
Tel 641-472-1691
bosolds@lisco.com

From: Scott Burger [scottburger@mac.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2016 3:20 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Comments to DOE regarding nuclear waste

To whom it may concern,

I am very concerned about nuclear waste in my home state of Virginia.

1. **Stop making it.** The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
2. **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
3. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
4. Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), **transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
5. **Geological repositories** must be **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), **socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.
6. **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.

7. **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers**, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.
8. **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.
9. **Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste**. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.
10. **Environmental justice**, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.**

Sincerely,
Scott Burger
612 S. Laurel Street
Richmond, VA 23220

804 714 5444

From: Deborah Cate [dfcate@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2016 11:23 AM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: We Do NOT Consent!

To the Department of Energy;

I do not consent to DOE rushing into *de facto* permanent parking lot dumps (so-called "centralized" or "consolidated interim storage"), in order to expedite the transfer of title and liability from the nuclear utilities that profited from the generation of high-level radioactive waste, onto the backs of taxpayers like me.

Don't know what to do with it? Stop making it! The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources--such as wind and solar--and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power. Clear energy can be generated at a fraction of the cost of nuclear and there is not toxic waste dilemma to face later.

The nuclear waster that has already been generated can be dealt with more responsibly. Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed “wet” storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.

Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, not to so-called centralized interim storage (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).

Geological repositories must be scientifically suitable (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forever-more), socially acceptable (**genuinely** consent-based), and environmentally just.

Environmental justice, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S. Take note of the consequences in violating this trust as has unfolded with the Standing Rock Sioux in North Dakota.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to my concerns. I trust that you will do right by the American public.

Regards,
Deborah F. Cate

From: Debra L Diegoli [dldiegolivt@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 28, 2016 7:11 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: "Consent-Based Siting" of radioactive waste dumps

To Whom It May Concern:

I have grave concerns about the proposed "consent-based" siting of nuclear waste dumps. the utmost care must be taking in handling this highly toxic and long-lasting waste.

My first concern is that of environmental justice. in keeping with President Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898,** which demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.

In all cases, irradiated nuclear fuel in should be stored in HOSS dry casks, as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.

Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not** to so-called "centralized interim storage" (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).

Geological repositories must be scientifically suitable (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), socially acceptable (genuinely consent-based), and environmentally just. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.

In view of the difficulties in finding safe storage, it is crucial that humans stop producing nuclear waste all together.

Sincerely,
Debra L. Diegoli
Weathersfield, Vermont

--
Debbie Diegoli

802-546-4587(H)
802-698-8661 (W)

From: Hwlyfstr@aol.com
Sent: Friday, October 28, 2016 6:02 AM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Consent??

1. **Stop making it.** The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
2. **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
3. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
4. Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), **transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico;Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
5. **Geological repositories** must be **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore),**socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century afterEnrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.
6. **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.
7. **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers**, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.
8. **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.

9. **Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste**. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.
10. **Environmental justice**, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.**

Gentlemen: People DO NOT "CONSENT" to your storing radio active waste anywhere except as outlined above by Beyond Nuclear on their carefully researched and rational statement quoted above. Do not think that we are going to fall for your ridiculous, dangerous and unprecedented pretence that people will "consent" to your dumping radioactive waste near people, water or in the environment. We have destroyed the earth in 150 years, since the industrial holocaust, that took BILLIONS of years to evolve. Unless you take heed of the above precautions, you are complicit in the rest of the destruction.

STOP MAKING IT. If we don't switch to renewables immediately, we're all done, including killing the earth. Beverly Foster, PA

From: Mark M Giese [m.mk@att.net]
Sent: Friday, October 28, 2016 10:24 AM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: "Consent-Based Siting"

1. **Stop making it.** The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
2. **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
3. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
4. Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), **transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
5. **Geological repositories** must be **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment *forevermore*), **socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.
6. **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.
7. **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS**

transfers, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.

8. **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.
9. **Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste**. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.
10. **Environmental justice**, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.**

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Mark M Giese
1520 Bryn Mawr Ave
Racine, WI 53403

From: Stephen Gliva [steveillini@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, October 28, 2016 8:08 AM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject:

1. **Stop making it.** The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.

From: E G [veggielady@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 29, 2016 2:51 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: I do NOT consent!

1. **Stop making it.** The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
2. **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
3. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
4. Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), **transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
5. **Geological repositories** must be **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), **socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.
6. **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.
7. **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers**, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.
8. **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.
9. **Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste**. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.
10. **Environmental justice**, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.**

Erica Gray

From: Jeanne Green [innerlight52@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2016 9:06 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: high level radioactive spent fuel

I agree wholeheartedly with all of these points. Nuclear power should have never happened. We knew we would have to deal with the waste someday and, guess what? There is no safe place to put it, just as the protesters early on said. No-one listened. Money rules, consequences for real people to the wind.

1. **Stop making it.** The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
2. **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
3. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
4. Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), **transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
5. **Geological repositories** must be **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), **socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.
6. **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River

Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.

7. **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers**, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.
8. **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.
9. **Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste**. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.
10. **Environmental justice**, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.**

Thank you for not allowing siting of these dangerous wastes in container parking lots.
Jeanne Green, Taos, NM

From: H James [relating2u@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2016 3:08 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Comments on Designing a Consent-Based Siting Process: Draft Summary of Public Input Report

The DOE Draft Summary has ignored many, if not most, public concerns. In the Agency's bid to define "consent" as weakly and minimally as possible, it seeks to open one or more centralized interim storage sites for high-level radioactive waste in opposition to the wishes of the American public.

I suggest that the report recommend the following:

- **Stop making it.** The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
- **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
- Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
- Reduce the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas) by **transporting irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
- Ensure that **Geological repositories** are **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), **socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.
- **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.

- **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers**, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.
- **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.
- **Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste**. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.
- Promote **Environmental justice**, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.**

Thank you,

Holly James
4042 N Harding
Chicago, IL 60618

From: Laura Horowitz [12newmoons@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2016 4:00 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: comment on consent-based siting

To Whom It May Concern-

I am writing to communicate my support for Beyond Nuclear's positions on consent-based siting. To quote BN's document:

Stop making it. The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.

Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed “wet” storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks.

Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.

Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, not to so-called centralized interim storage (de facto permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico;Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).

Geological repositories must be scientifically suitable (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore),socially acceptable (genuinely consent-based), and environmentally just. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can’t open any repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century afterEnrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world’s first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first “civilian” atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.

Do not reprocess (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk nuclear weapons proliferation, and be astronomically expensive; it would also very likely cause environmental ruin downwind and downstream of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.

Preserve and maintain “wet” storage pools – albeit emptied of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.
Carefully pass information about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, from one generation to the next, à la the concept of “Rolling Stewardship” described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.

Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.

Environmental justice, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely-

Laura Horowitz
Pittsburgh PA 15217

From: Marsha Jarvis [marshaj11@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2016 12:30 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Nuclear waste

To Whom It May Concern,

1. **Stop making it.** The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
2. **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
3. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
4. Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), **transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
5. **Geological repositories** must be **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore),**socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century afterEnrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.
6. **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.
7. **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers**, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.
8. **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.

Best,
Marsha ♥
510 316-0722 Cell

"As one becomes more Soulful, the Angel that you are Guides you through your life as God's intermediary--an Angel.
Miracles follow and limitations of God's Will are no longer."
~ His Holiness Buddha Maitreya
http://www.shambhalahealingtools.com/

From: Catherine Kilgore [vphoenixk@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2016 10:34 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: I do not consent to radioactive material dumping - second round public comments

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) released the summary of public comments regarding DOE's so-called "Consent-Based Siting" plan a mere 19 hours before its September 15 Washington, D.C. meeting. It essentially ignores the public input as well as broadly and vaguely defining what constitutes "consent" in regard to storage of nuclear/radioactive material. Since a second round of public comments has been opened, I am again submitting the following comments. I strongly urge you to follow these guidelines as a person suffering from environmental illness.

- **Stop making it.** The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
- **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
- Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
- Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), **transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (de-facto permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
- **Geological repositories** must be **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), **socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just

geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.

- **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel

. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France ; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.

- **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers**, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.
- **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.
- **Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste**.

Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.

- **Environmental justice**, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898**, **demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.**

Thank you,

Catherine L. Kilgore

From: Donna Knipp [knipp.donna@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2016 8:04 AM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: re: Irradiated Nuclear Fuel (High-Level Radioactive Waste)

1. **Stop making it.** The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
2. **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
3. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
4. Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), **transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
5. **Geological repositories** must be **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), **socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.
6. **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.
7. **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers**, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.

8. **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.
9. **Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste**. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.
10. **Environmental justice**, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.**

Sincerely,

Donna Knipp
New York City

--

_____

I can't understand why people are frightened of new ideas. I'm frightened of the old ones.
-- John Cage, composer (5 Sep 1912-1992)

From: Kate LaRanger [laranger26@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2016 6:47 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: no no no no no

Beyond Nuclear's Top Ten List for Comments to DOE re: Irradiated Nuclear Fuel (High-Level Radioactive Waste)

1. **Stop making it.** The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
2. **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
3. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
4. Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), **transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
5. **Geological repositories** must be **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), **socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.
6. **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.
7. **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers**, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.
8. **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.
9. **Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste**. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.
10. **Environmental justice**, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.**
11.

From: JazLeBlanc@aol.com
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2016 6:01 AM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: NO! NO! NO!

To the Department of Energy:

I do not consent to your plan to open one or more centralized interim storage sites for high-level radioactive waste.

I do not consent to your plan to continue using nuclear energy as a viable solution to anything. The nuclear age is over. You are the Department of ENERGY. It's time your agency embraces renewables as the ONLY viable power source we need along with energy efficiency and conservation. If our taxes pay your salaries, you are responsible to US, the taxpayers, not the coal, gas, oil and nuclear industries that have had you over a barrel for decades.

Here is the plan you need to follow about radioactive waste:

Stop making it. The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.

Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed “wet” storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks.
Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.

Please!! I live 14 miles from the failing, leaking, old and decrepit Indian Point Energy Center in Buchanan, NY. Spectra's Algonquin Pipeline has been constructed to run 105 feet from essential safety and security structures at Indian Point. Who is minding the store? What kool-aid are you all drinking to have let this happen in the first place?

Michelle LeBlanc
63 Seifert Lane
Putnam Valley NY 10579

From: magn0042 University of Minnesota [magn0042@umn.edu]
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2016 10:45 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: I do not consent

1. **Stop making nuclear waste.** The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
2. **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
3. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
4. Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), **transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico;Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
5. **Geological repositories** must be **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore),**socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century afterEnrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.
6. **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.
7. **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers**, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.
8. **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.
9. **Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste**. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.
10. **Environmental justice**, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.**

Sincerely,
Kathy Magne

From: leenaree@xmission.com
Sent: Friday, October 28, 2016 12:01 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: CCmments on Consent-based Siting of Nuclear Waste Dumps

1.Stop making it. The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.

2.Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed ?wet? storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks.

3.Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.

4.Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, not to so-called centralized interim storage (de facto permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).

5.Geological repositories must be scientifically suitable (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), socially acceptable (genuinely consent-based), and environmentally just. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can?t open any repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world?s first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years after the first ?civilian? atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.

6.Do not reprocess (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk nuclear weapons proliferation, and be astronomically expensive; it would also very likely cause environmental ruin downwind and downstream of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West

Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.

7.Preserve and maintain ?wet? storage pools ? albeit emptied of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.

8.Carefully pass information about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, from one generation to the next, à la the concept of ?Rolling Stewardship? described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.

9.Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.

10.Environmental justice, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Eileen McCabe
Bothell WA

Document Metadata:DOE-HQ-2016-0023-DRAFT-0005

Document Details

Docket ID:	DOE-HQ-2016-0023
Docket Title:	Designing a Consent-Based Siting Process *
Document File:	HTML
Docket Phase:	Notice
Phase Sequence:	1
Original Document ID:	DOE-HQ-2016-0023-DRAFT-0005
Current Document ID:	DOE-HQ-2016-0023-DRAFT-0005
Title:	Comment on FR Doc # 2016-22312
Number of Attachments:	0
Document Type:	PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS *
Document Subtype:	Public Comment
Comment on Document ID:	DOE-HQ-2016-0023-0001
Comment on Document Title:	Designing a Consent-Based Siting Process
Status:	Pending_Post
Received Date:	10/27/2016 *
Date Posted:	
Posting Restriction:	No restrictions
Submission Type:	API
Number of Submissions:	1 *

Document Optional Details

Status Set Date:	10/27/2016
Current Assignee:	Bacon, Cuttie (DOE)
Status Set By:	Public
Comment Start Date:	
Comment Due Date:	
Legacy ID:	
Tracking Number:	1k0-8spa-xq91
Total Page Count Including Attachments:	1

Submitter Info

Comment:

To whom it may concern, Please end any consideration of Consent Based Siting. It is a dangerous and discriminatory process. Please consider the following suggestions: The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power. Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed wet storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner. Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, not to so-called centralized interim storage (de facto permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.). Geological repositories must be scientifically suitable (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), socially acceptable (genuinely consent-based), and environmentally just. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it cant open any repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the worlds first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first civilian atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA. Do not reprocess (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk nuclear weapons proliferation, and be astronomically expensive; it would also very likely cause environmental ruin downwind and downstream of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc. Preserve and maintain wet storage pools albeit emptied of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown. Carefully pass information about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, from one generation to the next, la the concept of Rolling Stewardship described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility. Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the

	first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers. Environmental justice, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S. *
First Name:	James *
Middle Name:	
Last Name:	Melloh MD *
Mailing Address:	47 Sprague St *
Mailing Address 2:	--- *
City:	S Portland *
Country:	United States
State or Province:	Maine
ZIP/Postal Code:	04106 *
Email Address:	jmelloh@roadrunner.com
Phone Number:	
Fax Number:	
Organization Name:	Private health provider
Submitter's Representative:	
Government Agency Type:	
Government Agency:	
Cover Page:	

From: Pam Nelson [pamela05n@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2016 8:17 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: consent based siting

I do not agree with the consent-based siting agreement. The following explains:

1. **Stop making it.** The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
2. **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
3. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
4. Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), **transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
5. **Geological repositories** must be **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), **socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.
6. **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.
7. **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers**, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.
8. **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.
9. **Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste**. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.
10. **Environmental justice**, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.**

Pam Nelson
Warner Springs, CA

Document Metadata:DOE-HQ-2016-0023-DRAFT-0010

Document Details

Docket ID:	DOE-HQ-2016-0023
Docket Title:	Designing a Consent-Based Siting Process *
Document File:	
Docket Phase:	Notice
Phase Sequence:	1
Original Document ID:	DOE-HQ-2016-0023-DRAFT-0010
Current Document ID:	DOE-HQ-2016-0023-DRAFT-0010
Title:	Comment on FR Doc # 2016-22312
Number of Attachments:	0
Document Type:	PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS *
Document Subtype:	Public Comment
Comment on Document ID:	DOE-HQ-2016-0023-0001
Comment on Document Title:	Designing a Consent-Based Siting Process
Status:	Pending_Post
Received Date:	10/30/2016 *
Date Posted:	
Posting Restriction:	No restrictions
Submission Type:	API
Number of Submissions:	1 *

Document Optional Details

Status Set Date:	10/30/2016
Current Assignee:	Bacon, Cuttie (DOE)
Status Set By:	Public
Comment Start Date:	
Comment Due Date:	
Legacy ID:	
Tracking Number:	1k0-8sr1-5bsx
Total Page Count Including Attachments:	1

Submitter Info

Comment:

Shortcut fixes for the deadly problem of nuclear waste must not be allowed to protect the safety and health of American citizens, now and in the future. I agree with the others who address the following points on control and disposal of nuclear waste. Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed wet storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner. Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, not to so-called centralized interim storage (de facto permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.). Geological repositories must be scientifically suitable (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), socially acceptable (genuinely consent-based), and environmentally just. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it cant open any repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the worlds first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first civilian atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA. Do not reprocess (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk nuclear weapons proliferation, and be astronomically expensive; it would also very likely cause environmental ruin downwind and downstream of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc. Preserve and maintain wet storage pools albeit emptied of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown . Carefully pass information about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, from one generation to the next, la the concept of Rolling Stewardship described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility. Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear

	power ratepayers. Environmental justice, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S. *
First Name:	Edward *
Middle Name:	
Last Name:	Norkus *
Mailing Address:	263 Boyer Ave *
Mailing Address 2:	none *
City:	West Berlin *
Country:	United States
State or Province:	New Jersey
ZIP/Postal Code:	08091 *
Email Address:	enorkus@aol.com
Phone Number:	
Fax Number:	
Organization Name:	
Submitter's Representative:	
Government Agency Type:	
Government Agency:	
Cover Page:	

From: Carol Joan Patterson [joanie.patterson@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 4:15 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Consent-based siting

1. The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
2. **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
3. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
4. Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), **transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
5. **Geological repositories** must be **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), **socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.
6. **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.
7. **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS**

transfers, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.

8. **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.
9. **Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste**. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.
10. **Environmental justice**, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.**

From: Jeannie Pollak [jeannie22@roadrunner.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2016 12:21 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Consent-Based Siting

Regarding nuclear waste:

- **Stop making it.** The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
- **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
- Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
- Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), **transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
- **Geological repositories** must be **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), **socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.
- **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.
- **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers**, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.
- **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.

- **Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste**. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.
- **Environmental justice**, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.**

Thank you, Jeannie Pollak

Document Metadata:DOE-HQ-2016-0023-DRAFT-0006

Document Details

Docket ID:	DOE-HQ-2016-0023
Docket Title:	Designing a Consent-Based Siting Process *
Document File:	
Docket Phase:	Notice
Phase Sequence:	1
Original Document ID:	DOE-HQ-2016-0023-DRAFT-0006
Current Document ID:	DOE-HQ-2016-0023-DRAFT-0006
Title:	Comment on FR Doc # 2016-22312
Number of Attachments:	0
Document Type:	PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS *
Document Subtype:	Public Comment
Comment on Document ID:	DOE-HQ-2016-0023-0001
Comment on Document Title:	Designing a Consent-Based Siting Process
Status:	Pending_Post
Received Date:	10/27/2016 *
Date Posted:	
Posting Restriction:	No restrictions
Submission Type:	API
Number of Submissions:	1 *

Document Optional Details

Status Set Date:	10/27/2016
Current Assignee:	Bacon, Cuttie (DOE)
Status Set By:	Public
Comment Start Date:	
Comment Due Date:	
Legacy ID:	
Tracking Number:	1k0-8spf-iomb
Total Page Count Including Attachments:	1

Submitter Info

Comment:	The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power. Generating nuclear waste today, that must be maintained and guarded for thousands of years, is an unacceptable legacy to bequeath to many future generations. *
First Name:	Vincent *
Middle Name:	
Last Name:	Rubino *
Mailing Address:	555 Pierce Street *
Mailing Address 2:	555 Pierce Street *
City:	Albany *
Country:	United States
State or Province:	California
ZIP/Postal Code:	94706 *
Email Address:	convinceable@gmail.com
Phone Number:	
Fax Number:	
Organization Name:	
Submitter's Representative:	
Government Agency Type:	
Government Agency:	
Cover Page:	HTML

From: jeanne d shaw [maniart8@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2016 7:10 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: There is NO true "Consent based site" for Nuclear waste storage.

To the Department of Energy:

I do not consent to your plan to open one or more centralized interim storage sites for high-level radioactive waste anywhere in the world.

I do not consent to your plan to continue using nuclear energy as a viable solution to anything. The nuclear age is over. You are the Department of ENERGY. It's time your agency embraces renewables as the ONLY viable power source we need along with energy efficiency and conservation. If our taxes pay your salaries, you are responsible to US, the taxpayers, not the coal, gas, oil and nuclear industries that have had you over a barrel for decades.

Here is the plan you need to follow about radioactive waste:

Stop making it. The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.

Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed “wet” storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks.
Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.

Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, not to so-called centralized interim storage (de facto permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).

Geological repositories must be scientifically suitable (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore),socially acceptable (genuinely consent-based), and environmentally just.
Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in

more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open any repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA. Do not reprocess (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk nuclear weapons proliferation, and be astronomically expensive; it would also very likely cause environmental ruin downwind and downstream of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.

Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit emptied of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.

Carefully pass information about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship" described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.

Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers. This is neither Environmentally nor Fiscally responsible.

Environmental justice, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.

We live 5 1/2 miles from the failing, leaking, old and decrepit Indian Point Energy Center in Buchanan, NY. Spectra's Algonquin High Pressure Gas Pipeline has been constructed to run 105 feet from essential safety and security structures at Indian Point. Who is minding the store? What kool-aid are you all drinking to have let this happen in the first place?

So to reiterate: NO, I DO NOT CONSENT to Mobile Chernobyls, or Floating Fukushimas through New York, or to de facto permanent parking lot dumps for high-level radioactive waste anywhere, or to permanent burial dumps for high-level

radioactive waste on scientifically unsuitable, socially unacceptable, and/or environmentally unjust (radioactively racist) locations.

Face the fact: Nuclear Power is NOT affordable, NOT sustainable, and NOT acceptable as any kind of "solution" - long term or short term - to ANYTHING. And while not the ONLY problem with Nuclear Power, the problem of what to do with the radioactive waste is, all by itself, proof of that fact.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeanne and Gary Shaw
9 Van Cortlandt Place
Croton on Hudson, New York 10520

914 271 4183

Document Metadata:DOE-HQ-2016-0023-DRAFT-0002

Document Details

Docket ID:	DOE-HQ-2016-0023
Docket Title:	Designing a Consent-Based Siting Process *
Document File:	HTML
Docket Phase:	Notice
Phase Sequence:	1
Original Document ID:	DOE-HQ-2016-0023-DRAFT-0002
Current Document ID:	DOE-HQ-2016-0023-DRAFT-0002
Title:	Comment on FR Doc # 2016-22312
Number of Attachments:	0
Document Type:	PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS *
Document Subtype:	Public Comment
Comment on Document ID:	DOE-HQ-2016-0023-0001
Comment on Document Title:	Designing a Consent-Based Siting Process
Status:	Pending_Post
Received Date:	09/27/2016 *
Date Posted:	
Posting Restriction:	No restrictions
Submission Type:	API
Number of Submissions:	1 *

Document Optional Details

Status Set Date:	09/27/2016
Current Assignee:	Bacon, Cuttie (DOE)
Status Set By:	Public
Comment Start Date:	
Comment Due Date:	
Legacy ID:	
Tracking Number:	1k0-8s58-m4py
Total Page Count Including Attachments:	1

Submitter Info

Comment:

Dear Reviewer, I am adamantly opposed to your proposed Consent Based Siting plan for the following reason (among many others): - Stop making it. The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power. - Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed wet storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner. - Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, not to so-called centralized interim storage (de facto permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.). - Geological repositories must be scientifically suitable (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), socially acceptable (genuinely consent-based), and environmentally just. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it cant open any repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the worlds first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first civilian atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA. - Do not reprocess (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk nuclear weapons proliferation, and be astronomically expensive; it would also very likely cause environmental ruin downwind and downstream of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc. - Preserve and maintain wet storage pools - albeit emptied of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown. - Carefully pass information about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, from one generation to the next, la the concept of Rolling Stewardship described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility. - Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has

	estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers. and, especially, - Environmental justice, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S. Further information may be found on www.BeyondNuclear.org, which I support. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. *
First Name:	Betty J. *
Middle Name:	
Last Name:	Van Wicklen *
Mailing Address:	41 Lake Shore Dr. *
Mailing Address 2:	#2B *
City:	Watervliet *
Country:	United States
State or Province:	New York
ZIP/Postal Code:	12189-2915 *
Email Address:	bvanwick@nycap.rr.com
Phone Number:	999-999-9999
Fax Number:	
Organization Name:	
Submitter's Representative:	
Government Agency Type:	
Government Agency:	
Cover Page:	HTML

From: Satya Vayu [satyavayu@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2016 4:24 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Please listen to the actual public input on this vital issue!

In your "Draft Summary of Public Input Report" you neglected most of the concerns of the actual public input, and chose to define "consent" as weakly as possible. Simply put, the public doesn't want nuclear waste dumped in it's backyard. Please pay attention to these points:

1. **Stop making it.** The only truly safe, sound, just solution for the radioactive waste problem, is to not make it in the first place. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
2. **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
3. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
4. Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), **transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
5. **Geological repositories** must be **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), **socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.
6. **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.
7. **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers**, when old

HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.

8. **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.
9. **Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste**. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.
10. **Environmental justice**, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.**

From: unclebob@gorge.net
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2016 4:26 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: We say "NO" to Fukushima Freeways Nuclear Waste Storage.

1. **Stop making** radioactive waste. Electricity can be supplied by clean, safe, affordable renewable sources, such as wind and solar, and demand decreased significantly by efficiency, rather than generating radioactive waste via dirty, dangerous, and expensive nuclear power.
2. **Expedite the transfer of irradiated nuclear fuel from densely-packed "wet" storage pools into Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) dry casks**.
3. Store irradiated nuclear fuel in HOSS dry casks, **as safely and securely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, in a monitored, inspectable, retrievable manner.**
4. Given the unavoidable risks of high-level radioactive waste truck, train, and/or barge shipments on roads, rails, and/or waterways (Mobile Chernobyls, Dirty Bombs on Wheels, Floating Fukushimas), **transport irradiated nuclear fuel only once**, such as straight to a (suitable, acceptable, just) geological repository, **not to so-called centralized interim storage** (*de facto* permanent parking lot dumps, such as those currently targeted at Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Andrews County, west Texas; at Eddy-Lea Counties, near the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeast New Mexico; Native American reservations; nuclear power plants, such as Exelon's Dresden in Morris, IL; etc.).
5. **Geological repositories** must be **scientifically suitable** (capable of isolating the hazardous high-level radioactive waste from the living environment forevermore), **socially acceptable** (genuinely consent-based), and **environmentally just**. Note that no such suitable/acceptable/just geologic repository has yet been found, in more than half a century of looking. DOE has admitted it can't open *any* repository (even an unsuitable/unacceptable/unjust one) till 2048 at the earliest, more than a century after Enrico Fermi, in 1942, generated the first high-level radioactive waste, in the world's first reactor, as part of the Manhattan Project to build atomic bombs; and more than 90 years years after the first "civilian" atomic reactor began generating waste at Shippingport, PA.
6. **Do not reprocess** (extract fissile plutonium and/or uranium from) irradiated nuclear fuel. Not only would this risk **nuclear weapons proliferation**, and be **astronomically expensive**; it would also very likely cause **environmental ruin downwind and downstream** of wherever it is carried out, as has been shown at such places as Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; Savannah River Site, South Carolina; West Valley, New York; Sellafield, England; La Hague, France; Kyshtym, Russia; etc.
7. **Preserve and maintain "wet" storage pools – albeit *emptied* of irradiated nuclear fuel -- as an emergency back up location for cask-to-cask HOSS transfers**, when old HOSS casks deteriorate toward failure, and need to be replaced with brand new HOSS casks. That is, do not dismantle pools as part of nuclear power plant decommissioning post-reactor shutdown.

8. **Carefully pass information** about storing irradiated nuclear fuel as safely as possible, as close to the point of generation as possible, **from one generation to the next, à la the concept of "Rolling Stewardship"** described by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.
9. **Address the shortfall in funding for forevermore storage of high-level radioactive waste**. Dr. Mark Cooper of Vermont Law School has estimated the first 200 years of commercial irradiated nuclear fuel storage (assuming just a single repository, although at least two will be required!) will cost $210 to $350 billion, even though there is only some tens of billions of dollars remaining in the now-terminated Nuclear Waste Fund, collected from nuclear power ratepayers.
10. **Environmental justice**, in keeping with Bill Clinton's 1994 **Executive Order 12898, demands that Native American communities and lands, as well as those of other low income and/or people of color communities, never again be targeted for high-level radioactive waste parking lot dumps or permanent burial sites, a shameful form of radioactive racism dating back decades in the U.S.**

Thanks for reading this. Please keep the USA safe from nuclear radiation and pollution.

John and Polly Wood

Hood River, Oregon 97031

[**BRC Parent Form**]

From: Leslie Dee [leslie1@mediacombb.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2016 8:58 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment

I support the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future's recommendation to implement an explicitly adaptive, staged and consent-based approach to nuclear waste disposal. And I welcome the opportunity provided by the U.S. Department of Energy to submit comments on the agency's nascent effort to design a consent-based siting process.

Achieving consent-based siting, if done right, could lay the foundation for a fair and just process for siting a nuclear waste management facility that will well position the federal government – after decades of failure – to meet its nuclear waste management commitments and begin to restore the loss of trust and confidence in its ability to find a viable and permanent solution to our waste crisis.

I support and urge the DOE to apply the following 10 Criteria for Community Consent:

1) Informed - Communities must know what they are consenting to at each stage of the process. Early and often public engagement activities should offer the public, community leaders, experts and agency representatives frequent opportunities to exchange information. Information must be accessible and offered through a variety of platforms. The full range of cost and risks associated with the project must be disclosed and verified, as well as alternatives being considered. Achieving informed consent is not an end, but an ongoing exercise that responds to new information and findings as well as new generations.

2) Inclusive - Consent should be granted by those most impacted, including states, tribes and communities. A broad range of state, tribal and local stakeholders should be included in the decision-making process, and efforts must be made to increase the number of community members who recognize themselves and their communities as stakeholders in the siting process. People and entities that would financially benefit from the siting process should be clearly disclosed.

3) Collaborative - Consent can't be achieved through a top-down process. Activities related to outreach, engagement and education must be planned in coordination with appropriate stakeholders. Any agreements or decision-making must result from mutual input and understanding, and must be responsive to the concerns of citizens.

4) Just - Consent should not be bought. Financial compensation and other incentives must be reasonable, not used as coercion, and negotiated with full public disclosure.

5) Transparent - Consent must be pursued through an open process. Consent can be achieved and maintained through trust. Open access to information includes disclosure of funding and any conflicts of interest with the sources of information. All meetings, hearings and communications must be open to the public and on record.

6) Legitimate - A consent-based siting process must not just be the policy of the Department of Energy, but the law of the land.

7) Balanced- Consent will require sharing of power among federal executive and legislative branches, and state and local governments and communities. Negotiating and decision-making power must be shared among affected federal, state and local entities, including those in the transportation sector. States also should be granted some authority over regulation of the facility.

8) Flexible - Consent can be withdrawn. The consent-based siting process must provide ample opportunity and defined moments to correct course or completely withdrawal from the siting process.

9) Contractual - States, tribes and communities must have clear recourse if the terms of consent are breached.

10) Tailored – The consent process must be responsive to each situation. While these common elements should be applied to any consent-based process, any approach must be tailored to the specific, unique needs of the particular state, tribe and communities where a waste dump is being considered.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Leslie Dee

55378

From: Neil Bleifeld [Procrastus@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 01, 2016 7:28 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment

I support the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future's recommendation to implement an explicitly adaptive, staged and consent-based approach to nuclear waste disposal. And I welcome the opportunity provided by the U.S. Department of Energy to submit comments on the agency's nascent effort to design a consent-based siting process.

Achieving consent-based siting, if done right, could lay the foundation for a fair and just process for siting a nuclear waste management facility that will well position the federal government – after decades of failure – to meet its nuclear waste management commitments and begin to restore the loss of trust and confidence in its ability to find a viable and permanent solution to our waste crisis.

I support and urge the DOE to apply the following 10 Criteria for Community Consent:

1) Informed - Communities must know what they are consenting to at each stage of the process. Early and often public engagement activities should offer the public, community leaders, experts and agency representatives frequent opportunities to exchange information. Information must be accessible and offered through a variety of platforms. The full range of cost and risks associated with the project must be disclosed and verified, as well as alternatives being considered. Achieving informed consent is not an end, but an ongoing exercise that responds to new information and findings as well as new generations.

2) Inclusive - Consent should be granted by those most impacted, including states, tribes and communities. A broad range of state, tribal and local stakeholders should be included in the decision-making process, and efforts must be made to increase the number of community members who recognize themselves and their communities as stakeholders in the siting process. People and entities that would financially benefit from the siting process should be clearly disclosed.

3) Collaborative - Consent can't be achieved through a top-down process. Activities related to outreach, engagement and education must be planned in coordination with appropriate stakeholders. Any agreements or decision-making must result from mutual input and understanding, and must be responsive to the concerns of citizens.

4) Just - Consent should not be bought. Financial compensation and other incentives must be reasonable, not used as coercion, and negotiated with full public disclosure.

5) Transparent - Consent must be pursued through an open process. Consent can be achieved and maintained through trust. Open access to information includes disclosure of funding and any conflicts of interest with the sources of information. All meetings, hearings and communications must be open to the public and on record.

6) Legitimate - A consent-based siting process must not just be the policy of the Department of Energy, but the law of the land.

7) Balanced- Consent will require sharing of power among federal executive and legislative branches, and state and local governments and communities. Negotiating and decision-making power must be shared among affected federal, state and local entities, including those in the transportation sector. States also should be granted some authority over regulation of the facility.

8) Flexible - Consent can be withdrawn. The consent-based siting process must provide ample opportunity and defined moments to correct course or completely withdrawal from the siting process.

9) Contractual - States, tribes and communities must have clear recourse if the terms of consent are breached.

10) Tailored – The consent process must be responsive to each situation. While these common elements should be applied to any consent-based process, any approach must be tailored to the specific, unique needs of the particular state, tribe and communities where a waste dump is being considered.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Neil Bleifeld

10036

From: Tiana Brachel [tianabrachel@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 3:35 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment

I support the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future's recommendation to implement an explicitly adaptive, staged and consent-based approach to nuclear waste disposal. And I welcome the opportunity provided by the U.S. Department of Energy to submit comments on the agency's nascent effort to design a consent-based siting process.

Achieving consent-based siting, if done right, could lay the foundation for a fair and just process for siting a nuclear waste management facility that will well position the federal government – after decades of failure – to meet its nuclear waste management commitments and begin to restore the loss of trust and confidence in its ability to find a viable and permanent solution to our waste crisis.

I support and urge the DOE to apply the following 10 Criteria for Community Consent:

1) Informed - Communities must know what they are consenting to at each stage of the process. Early and often public engagement activities should offer the public, community leaders, experts and agency representatives frequent opportunities to exchange information. Information must be accessible and offered through a variety of platforms. The full range of cost and risks associated with the project must be disclosed and verified, as well as alternatives being considered. Achieving informed consent is not an end, but an ongoing exercise that responds to new information and findings as well as new generations.

2) Inclusive - Consent should be granted by those most impacted, including states, tribes and communities. A broad range of state, tribal and local stakeholders should be included in the decision-making process, and efforts must be made to increase the number of community members who recognize themselves and their communities as stakeholders in the siting process. People and entities that would financially benefit from the siting process should be clearly disclosed.

3) Collaborative - Consent can't be achieved through a top-down process. Activities related to outreach, engagement and education must be planned in coordination with appropriate stakeholders. Any agreements or decision-making must result from mutual input and understanding, and must be responsive to the concerns of citizens.

4) Just - Consent should not be bought. Financial compensation and other incentives must be reasonable, not used as coercion, and negotiated with full public disclosure.

5) Transparent - Consent must be pursued through an open process. Consent can be achieved and maintained through trust. Open access to information includes disclosure of funding and any conflicts of interest with the sources of information. All meetings, hearings and communications must be open to the public and on record.

6) Legitimate - A consent-based siting process must not just be the policy of the Department of Energy, but the law of the land.

7) Balanced- Consent will require sharing of power among federal executive and legislative branches, and state and local governments and communities. Negotiating and decision-making power must be shared among affected federal, state and local entities, including those in the transportation sector. States also should be granted some authority over regulation of the facility.

8) Flexible - Consent can be withdrawn. The consent-based siting process must provide ample opportunity and defined moments to correct course or completely withdrawal from the siting process.

9) Contractual - States, tribes and communities must have clear recourse if the terms of consent are breached.

10) Tailored – The consent process must be responsive to each situation. While these common elements should be applied to any consent-based process, any approach must be tailored to the specific, unique needs of the particular state, tribe and communities where a waste dump is being considered.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Tiana Brachel

30121

From: Tiana Brachel [tianabrachel@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 7:07 AM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment

I support the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future's recommendation to implement an explicitly adaptive, staged and consent-based approach to nuclear waste disposal. And I welcome the opportunity provided by the U.S. Department of Energy to submit comments on the agency's nascent effort to design a consent-based siting process.

Achieving consent-based siting, if done right, could lay the foundation for a fair and just process for siting a nuclear waste management facility that will well position the federal government – after decades of failure – to meet its nuclear waste management commitments and begin to restore the loss of trust and confidence in its ability to find a viable and permanent solution to our waste crisis.

I support and urge the DOE to apply the following 10 Criteria for Community Consent:

1) Informed - Communities must know what they are consenting to at each stage of the process. Early and often public engagement activities should offer the public, community leaders, experts and agency representatives frequent opportunities to exchange information. Information must be accessible and offered through a variety of platforms. The full range of cost and risks associated with the project must be disclosed and verified, as well as alternatives being considered. Achieving informed consent is not an end, but an ongoing exercise that responds to new information and findings as well as new generations.

2) Inclusive - Consent should be granted by those most impacted, including states, tribes and communities. A broad range of state, tribal and local stakeholders should be included in the decision-making process, and efforts must be made to increase the number of community members who recognize themselves and their communities as stakeholders in the siting process. People and entities that would financially benefit from the siting process should be clearly disclosed.

3) Collaborative - Consent can't be achieved through a top-down process. Activities related to outreach, engagement and education must be planned in coordination with appropriate stakeholders. Any agreements or decision-making must result from mutual input and understanding, and must be responsive to the concerns of citizens.

4) Just - Consent should not be bought. Financial compensation and other incentives must be reasonable, not used as coercion, and negotiated with full public disclosure.

5) Transparent - Consent must be pursued through an open process. Consent can be achieved and maintained through trust. Open access to information includes disclosure of funding and any conflicts of interest with the sources of information. All meetings, hearings and communications must be open to the public and on record.

6) Legitimate - A consent-based siting process must not just be the policy of the Department of Energy, but the law of the land.

7) Balanced- Consent will require sharing of power among federal executive and legislative branches, and state and local governments and communities. Negotiating and decision-making power must be shared among affected federal, state and local entities, including those in the transportation sector. States also should be granted some authority over regulation of the facility.

8) Flexible - Consent can be withdrawn. The consent-based siting process must provide ample opportunity and defined moments to correct course or completely withdrawal from the siting process.

9) Contractual - States, tribes and communities must have clear recourse if the terms of consent are breached.

10) Tailored – The consent process must be responsive to each situation. While these common elements should be applied to any consent-based process, any approach must be tailored to the specific, unique needs of the particular state, tribe and communities where a waste dump is being considered.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Tiana Brachel

30121

From: Deb Brown [deb@econweb.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2016 2:11 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment

I support the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future's recommendation to implement an explicitly adaptive, staged and consent-based approach to nuclear waste disposal. And I welcome the opportunity provided by the U.S. Department of Energy to submit comments on the agency's nascent effort to design a consent-based siting process.

Achieving consent-based siting, if done right, could lay the foundation for a fair and just process for siting a nuclear waste management facility that will well position the federal government – after decades of failure – to meet its nuclear waste management commitments and begin to restore the loss of trust and confidence in its ability to find a viable and permanent solution to our waste crisis.

I support and urge the DOE to apply the following 10 Criteria for Community Consent:

1) Informed - Communities must know what they are consenting to at each stage of the process. Early and often public engagement activities should offer the public, community leaders, experts and agency representatives frequent opportunities to exchange information. Information must be accessible and offered through a variety of platforms. The full range of cost and risks associated with the project must be disclosed and verified, as well as alternatives being considered. Achieving informed consent is not an end, but an ongoing exercise that responds to new information and findings as well as new generations.

2) Inclusive - Consent should be granted by those most impacted, including states, tribes and communities. A broad range of state, tribal and local stakeholders should be included in the decision-making process, and efforts must be made to increase the number of community members who recognize themselves and their communities as stakeholders in the siting process. People and entities that would financially benefit from the siting process should be clearly disclosed.

3) Collaborative - Consent can't be achieved through a top-down process. Activities related to outreach, engagement and education must be planned in coordination with appropriate stakeholders. Any agreements or decision-making must result from mutual input and understanding, and must be responsive to the concerns of citizens.

4) Just - Consent should not be bought. Financial compensation and other incentives must be reasonable, not used as coercion, and negotiated with full public disclosure.

5) Transparent - Consent must be pursued through an open process. Consent can be achieved and maintained through trust. Open access to information includes disclosure of funding and any conflicts of interest with the sources of information. All meetings, hearings and communications must be open to the public and on record.

6) Legitimate - A consent-based siting process must not just be the policy of the Department of Energy, but the law of the land.

7) Balanced- Consent will require sharing of power among federal executive and legislative branches, and state and local governments and communities. Negotiating and decision-making power must be shared among affected federal, state and local entities, including those in the transportation sector. States also should be granted some authority over regulation of the facility.

8) Flexible - Consent can be withdrawn. The consent-based siting process must provide ample opportunity and defined moments to correct course or completely withdrawal from the siting process.

9) Contractual - States, tribes and communities must have clear recourse if the terms of consent are breached.

10) Tailored – The consent process must be responsive to each situation. While these common elements should be applied to any consent-based process, any approach must be tailored to the specific, unique needs of the particular state, tribe and communities where a waste dump is being considered.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Deb Brown

27624

From: Deb Brown [deb@econweb.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2016 2:17 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Please listen to the experts at Beyond Nuclear

To whom it may concern:

It seems very disingenuous that the U.S. federal government and nuclear industry are now seeking public consent to dispose of high-level radioactive waste, when they never sought consent for the generation of nuclear waste in any of the operational licensing and license extension proceedings.

Please listen to the experts at Beyond Nuclear and Public Citizen:

I support the Blue Ribbon Commission on America¹s Nuclear Future¹s recommendation to implement an explicitly adaptive, staged and consent-based approach to nuclear waste disposal. And I welcome the opportunity provided by the U.S. Department of Energy to submit comments on the agency¹s nascent effort to design a consent-based siting process.

Achieving consent-based siting, if done right, could lay the foundation for a fair and just process for siting a nuclear waste management facility that will well position the federal government after decades of failure to meet its nuclear waste management commitments and begin to restore the loss of trust and confidence in its ability to find a viable and permanent solution to our waste crisis.

I support and urge the DOE to apply the following 10 Criteria for Community Consent:

1) Informed - Communities must know what they are consenting to at each stage of the process. Early and often public engagement activities should offer the public, community leaders, experts and agency representatives frequent opportunities to exchange information. Information must be accessible and offered through a variety of platforms. The full range of cost and risks associated with the project must be disclosed and verified, as well as alternatives being considered. Achieving informed consent is not an end, but an ongoing exercise that responds to new information and findings as well as new generations.

2) Inclusive - Consent should be granted by those most impacted, including states, tribes and communities. A broad range of state, tribal and local stakeholders should be included in the decision-making process, and efforts must be made to increase the number of community members who recognize themselves and their communities as stakeholders in the siting process. People and entities that would financially benefit from the siting process should be clearly disclosed.

3) Collaborative - Consent can¹t be achieved through a top-down process. Activities related to outreach, engagement and education must be planned

in coordination with appropriate stakeholders. Any agreements or decision-making must result from mutual input and understanding, and must be responsive to the concerns of citizens.

4) Just - Consent should not be bought. Financial compensation and other incentives must be reasonable, not used as coercion, and negotiated with full public disclosure.

5) Transparent - Consent must be pursued through an open process. Consent can be achieved and maintained through trust. Open access to information includes disclosure of funding and any conflicts of interest with the sources of information. All meetings, hearings and communications must be open to the public and on record.

6) Legitimate - A consent-based siting process must not just be the policy of the Department of Energy, but the law of the land.

7) Balanced- Consent will require sharing of power among federal executive and legislative branches, and state and local governments and communities. Negotiating and decision-making power must be shared among affected federal, state and local entities, including those in the transportation sector. States also should be granted some authority over regulation of the facility.

8) Flexible - Consent can be withdrawn. The consent-based siting process must provide ample opportunity and defined moments to correct course or completely withdrawal from the siting process.

9) Contractual - States, tribes and communities must have clear recourse if the terms of consent are breached.

10) Tailored The consent process must be responsive to each situation. While these common elements should be applied to any consent-based process, any approach must be tailored to the specific, unique needs of the particular state, tribe and communities where a waste dump is being considered.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Deb Brown

From: Ken Gilmour [cinken@sympatico.ca]
Sent: Friday, October 14, 2016 5:36 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment

I support the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future's recommendation to implement an explicitly adaptive, staged and consent-based approach to nuclear waste disposal. And I welcome the opportunity provided by the U.S. Department of Energy to submit comments on the agency's nascent effort to design a consent-based siting process.

Achieving consent-based siting, if done right, could lay the foundation for a fair and just process for siting a nuclear waste management facility that will well position the federal government – after decades of failure – to meet its nuclear waste management commitments and begin to restore the loss of trust and confidence in its ability to find a viable and permanent solution to our waste crisis.

I support and urge the DOE to apply the following 10 Criteria for Community Consent:

1) Informed - Communities must know what they are consenting to at each stage of the process. Early and often public engagement activities should offer the public, community leaders, experts and agency representatives frequent opportunities to exchange information. Information must be accessible and offered through a variety of platforms. The full range of cost and risks associated with the project must be disclosed and verified, as well as alternatives being considered. Achieving informed consent is not an end, but an ongoing exercise that responds to new information and findings as well as new generations.

2) Inclusive - Consent should be granted by those most impacted, including states, tribes and communities. A broad range of state, tribal and local stakeholders should be included in the decision-making process, and efforts must be made to increase the number of community members who recognize themselves and their communities as stakeholders in the siting process. People and entities that would financially benefit from the siting process should be clearly disclosed.

3) Collaborative - Consent can't be achieved through a top-down process. Activities related to outreach, engagement and education must be planned in coordination with appropriate stakeholders. Any agreements or decision-making must result from mutual input and understanding, and must be responsive to the concerns of citizens.

4) Just - Consent should not be bought. Financial compensation and other incentives must be reasonable, not used as coercion, and negotiated with full public disclosure.

5) Transparent - Consent must be pursued through an open process. Consent can be achieved and maintained through trust. Open access to information includes disclosure of funding and any conflicts of interest with the sources of information. All meetings, hearings and communications must be open to the public and on record.

6) Legitimate - A consent-based siting process must not just be the policy of the Department of Energy, but the law of the land.

7) Balanced- Consent will require sharing of power among federal executive and legislative branches, and state and local governments and communities. Negotiating and decision-making power must be shared among affected federal, state and local entities, including those in the transportation sector. States also should be granted some authority over regulation of the facility.

8) Flexible - Consent can be withdrawn. The consent-based siting process must provide ample opportunity and defined moments to correct course or completely withdrawal from the siting process.

9) Contractual - States, tribes and communities must have clear recourse if the terms of consent are breached.

10) Tailored – The consent process must be responsive to each situation. While these common elements should be applied to any consent-based process, any approach must be tailored to the specific, unique needs of the particular state, tribe and communities where a waste dump is being considered.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ken Gilmour

K9J 5E2

From: Helen Goldenberg [helengolde@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, September 30, 2016 8:23 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment

I support the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future's recommendation to implement an explicitly adaptive, staged and consent-based approach to nuclear waste disposal. And I welcome the opportunity provided by the U.S. Department of Energy to submit comments on the agency's nascent effort to design a consent-based siting process.

Achieving consent-based siting, if done right, could lay the foundation for a fair and just process for siting a nuclear waste management facility that will well position the federal government – after decades of failure – to meet its nuclear waste management commitments and begin to restore the loss of trust and confidence in its ability to find a viable and permanent solution to our waste crisis.

I support and urge the DOE to apply the following 10 Criteria for Community Consent:

1) Informed - Communities must know what they are consenting to at each stage of the process. Early and often public engagement activities should offer the public, community leaders, experts and agency representatives frequent opportunities to exchange information. Information must be accessible and offered through a variety of platforms. The full range of cost and risks associated with the project must be disclosed and verified, as well as alternatives being considered. Achieving informed consent is not an end, but an ongoing exercise that responds to new information and findings as well as new generations.

2) Inclusive - Consent should be granted by those most impacted, including states, tribes and communities. A broad range of state, tribal and local stakeholders should be included in the decision-making process, and efforts must be made to increase the number of community members who recognize themselves and their communities as stakeholders in the siting process. People and entities that would financially benefit from the siting process should be clearly disclosed.

3) Collaborative - Consent can't be achieved through a top-down process. Activities related to outreach, engagement and education must be planned in coordination with appropriate stakeholders. Any agreements or decision-making must result from mutual input and understanding, and must be responsive to the concerns of citizens.

4) Just - Consent should not be bought. Financial compensation and other incentives must be reasonable, not used as coercion, and negotiated with full public disclosure.

5) Transparent - Consent must be pursued through an open process. Consent can be achieved and maintained through trust. Open access to information includes disclosure of funding and any conflicts of interest with the sources of information. All meetings, hearings and communications must be open to the public and on record.

6) Legitimate - A consent-based siting process must not just be the policy of the Department of Energy, but the law of the land.

7) Balanced- Consent will require sharing of power among federal executive and legislative branches, and state and local governments and communities. Negotiating and decision-making power must be shared among affected federal, state and local entities, including those in the transportation sector. States also should be granted some authority over regulation of the facility.

8) Flexible - Consent can be withdrawn. The consent-based siting process must provide ample opportunity and defined moments to correct course or completely withdrawal from the siting process.

9) Contractual - States, tribes and communities must have clear recourse if the terms of consent are breached.

10) Tailored – The consent process must be responsive to each situation. While these common elements should be applied to any consent-based process, any approach must be tailored to the specific, unique needs of the particular state, tribe and communities where a waste dump is being considered.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Helen Goldenberg

33321

From: Jackie Griffeth [polareclipse87@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 15, 2016 9:26 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment

I support the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future's recommendation to implement an explicitly adaptive, staged and consent-based approach to nuclear waste disposal. And I welcome the opportunity provided by the U.S. Department of Energy to submit comments on the agency's nascent effort to design a consent-based siting process.

Achieving consent-based siting, if done right, could lay the foundation for a fair and just process for siting a nuclear waste management facility that will well position the federal government – after decades of failure – to meet its nuclear waste management commitments and begin to restore the loss of trust and confidence in its ability to find a viable and permanent solution to our waste crisis.

I support and urge the DOE to apply the following 10 Criteria for Community Consent:

1) Informed - Communities must know what they are consenting to at each stage of the process. Early and often public engagement activities should offer the public, community leaders, experts and agency representatives frequent opportunities to exchange information. Information must be accessible and offered through a variety of platforms. The full range of cost and risks associated with the project must be disclosed and verified, as well as alternatives being considered. Achieving informed consent is not an end, but an ongoing exercise that responds to new information and findings as well as new generations.

2) Inclusive - Consent should be granted by those most impacted, including states, tribes and communities. A broad range of state, tribal and local stakeholders should be included in the decision-making process, and efforts must be made to increase the number of community members who recognize themselves and their communities as stakeholders in the siting process. People and entities that would financially benefit from the siting process should be clearly disclosed.

3) Collaborative - Consent can't be achieved through a top-down process. Activities related to outreach, engagement and education must be planned in coordination with appropriate stakeholders. Any agreements or decision-making must result from mutual input and understanding, and must be responsive to the concerns of citizens.

4) Just - Consent should not be bought. Financial compensation and other incentives must be reasonable, not used as coercion, and negotiated with full public disclosure.

5) Transparent - Consent must be pursued through an open process. Consent can be achieved and maintained through trust. Open access to information includes disclosure of funding and any conflicts of interest with the sources of information. All meetings, hearings and communications must be open to the public and on record.

6) Legitimate - A consent-based siting process must not just be the policy of the Department of Energy, but the law of the land.

7) Balanced- Consent will require sharing of power among federal executive and legislative branches, and state and local governments and communities. Negotiating and decision-making power must be shared among affected federal, state and local entities, including those in the transportation sector. States also should be granted some authority over regulation of the facility.

8) Flexible - Consent can be withdrawn. The consent-based siting process must provide ample opportunity and defined moments to correct course or completely withdrawal from the siting process.

9) Contractual - States, tribes and communities must have clear recourse if the terms of consent are breached.

10) Tailored – The consent process must be responsive to each situation. While these common elements should be applied to any consent-based process, any approach must be tailored to the specific, unique needs of the particular state, tribe and communities where a waste dump is being considered.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jackie Griffeth

80916

From: JoAnn Loomis [luckygg@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 18, 2016 5:33 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment

I support the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future's recommendation to implement an explicitly adaptive, staged and consent-based approach to nuclear waste disposal. And I welcome the opportunity provided by the U.S. Department of Energy to submit comments on the agency's nascent effort to design a consent-based siting process.

Achieving consent-based siting, if done right, could lay the foundation for a fair and just process for siting a nuclear waste management facility that will well position the federal government – after decades of failure – to meet its nuclear waste management commitments and begin to restore the loss of trust and confidence in its ability to find a viable and permanent solution to our waste crisis.

I support and urge the DOE to apply the following 10 Criteria for Community Consent:

1) Informed - Communities must know what they are consenting to at each stage of the process. Early and often public engagement activities should offer the public, community leaders, experts and agency representatives frequent opportunities to exchange information. Information must be accessible and offered through a variety of platforms. The full range of cost and risks associated with the project must be disclosed and verified, as well as alternatives being considered. Achieving informed consent is not an end, but an ongoing exercise that responds to new information and findings as well as new generations.

2) Inclusive - Consent should be granted by those most impacted, including states, tribes and communities. A broad range of state, tribal and local stakeholders should be included in the decision-making process, and efforts must be made to increase the number of community members who recognize themselves and their communities as stakeholders in the siting process. People and entities that would financially benefit from the siting process should be clearly disclosed.

3) Collaborative - Consent can't be achieved through a top-down process. Activities related to outreach, engagement and education must be planned in coordination with appropriate stakeholders. Any agreements or decision-making must result from mutual input and understanding, and must be responsive to the concerns of citizens.

4) Just - Consent should not be bought. Financial compensation and other incentives must be reasonable, not used as coercion, and negotiated with full public disclosure.

5) Transparent - Consent must be pursued through an open process. Consent can be achieved and maintained through trust. Open access to information includes disclosure of funding and any conflicts of interest with the sources of information. All meetings, hearings and communications must be open to the public and on record.

6) Legitimate - A consent-based siting process must not just be the policy of the Department of Energy, but the law of the land.

7) Balanced- Consent will require sharing of power among federal executive and legislative branches, and state and local governments and communities. Negotiating and decision-making power must be shared among affected federal, state and local entities, including those in the transportation sector. States also should be granted some authority over regulation of the facility.

8) Flexible - Consent can be withdrawn. The consent-based siting process must provide ample opportunity and defined moments to correct course or completely withdrawal from the siting process.

9) Contractual - States, tribes and communities must have clear recourse if the terms of consent are breached.

10) Tailored – The consent process must be responsive to each situation. While these common elements should be applied to any consent-based process, any approach must be tailored to the specific, unique needs of the particular state, tribe and communities where a waste dump is being considered.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JoAnn Loomis

46259

From: Kimberly Lowe [kim.klowe1@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2016 11:55 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment

I support the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future's recommendation to implement an explicitly adaptive, staged and consent-based approach to nuclear waste disposal. And I welcome the opportunity provided by the U.S. Department of Energy to submit comments on the agency's nascent effort to design a consent-based siting process.

Achieving consent-based siting, if done right, could lay the foundation for a fair and just process for siting a nuclear waste management facility that will well position the federal government – after decades of failure – to meet its nuclear waste management commitments and begin to restore the loss of trust and confidence in its ability to find a viable and permanent solution to our waste crisis.

I support and urge the DOE to apply the following 10 Criteria for Community Consent:

1) Informed - Communities must know what they are consenting to at each stage of the process. Early and often public engagement activities should offer the public, community leaders, experts and agency representatives frequent opportunities to exchange information. Information must be accessible and offered through a variety of platforms. The full range of cost and risks associated with the project must be disclosed and verified, as well as alternatives being considered. Achieving informed consent is not an end, but an ongoing exercise that responds to new information and findings as well as new generations.

2) Inclusive - Consent should be granted by those most impacted, including states, tribes and communities. A broad range of state, tribal and local stakeholders should be included in the decision-making process, and efforts must be made to increase the number of community members who recognize themselves and their communities as stakeholders in the siting process. People and entities that would financially benefit from the siting process should be clearly disclosed.

3) Collaborative - Consent can't be achieved through a top-down process. Activities related to outreach, engagement and education must be planned in coordination with appropriate stakeholders. Any agreements or decision-making must result from mutual input and understanding, and must be responsive to the concerns of citizens.

4) Just - Consent should not be bought. Financial compensation and other incentives must be reasonable, not used as coercion, and negotiated with full public disclosure.

5) Transparent - Consent must be pursued through an open process. Consent can be achieved and maintained through trust. Open access to information includes disclosure of funding and any conflicts of interest with the sources of information. All meetings, hearings and communications must be open to the public and on record.

6) Legitimate - A consent-based siting process must not just be the policy of the Department of Energy, but the law of the land.

7) Balanced- Consent will require sharing of power among federal executive and legislative branches, and state and local governments and communities. Negotiating and decision-making power must be shared among affected federal, state and local entities, including those in the transportation sector. States also should be granted some authority over regulation of the facility.

8) Flexible - Consent can be withdrawn. The consent-based siting process must provide ample opportunity and defined moments to correct course or completely withdrawal from the siting process.

9) Contractual - States, tribes and communities must have clear recourse if the terms of consent are breached.

10) Tailored – The consent process must be responsive to each situation. While these common elements should be applied to any consent-based process, any approach must be tailored to the specific, unique needs of the particular state, tribe and communities where a waste dump is being considered.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Lowe

44703

From: eric nicholson [ericnchlsn@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 16, 2016 10:07 AM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment

I support the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future's recommendation to implement an explicitly adaptive, staged and consent-based approach to nuclear waste disposal. And I welcome the opportunity provided by the U.S. Department of Energy to submit comments on the agency's nascent effort to design a consent-based siting process.

Achieving consent-based siting, if done right, could lay the foundation for a fair and just process for siting a nuclear waste management facility that will well position the federal government – after decades of failure – to meet its nuclear waste management commitments and begin to restore the loss of trust and confidence in its ability to find a viable and permanent solution to our waste crisis.

I support and urge the DOE to apply the following 10 Criteria for Community Consent:

1) Informed - Communities must know what they are consenting to at each stage of the process. Early and often public engagement activities should offer the public, community leaders, experts and agency representatives frequent opportunities to exchange information. Information must be accessible and offered through a variety of platforms. The full range of cost and risks associated with the project must be disclosed and verified, as well as alternatives being considered. Achieving informed consent is not an end, but an ongoing exercise that responds to new information and findings as well as new generations.

2) Inclusive - Consent should be granted by those most impacted, including states, tribes and communities. A broad range of state, tribal and local stakeholders should be included in the decision-making process, and efforts must be made to increase the number of community members who recognize themselves and their communities as stakeholders in the siting process. People and entities that would financially benefit from the siting process should be clearly disclosed.

3) Collaborative - Consent can't be achieved through a top-down process. Activities related to outreach, engagement and education must be planned in coordination with appropriate stakeholders. Any agreements or decision-making must result from mutual input and understanding, and must be responsive to the concerns of citizens.

4) Just - Consent should not be bought. Financial compensation and other incentives must be reasonable, not used as coercion, and negotiated with full public disclosure.

5) Transparent - Consent must be pursued through an open process. Consent can be achieved and maintained through trust. Open access to information includes disclosure of funding and any conflicts of interest with the sources of information. All meetings, hearings and communications must be open to the public and on record.

6) Legitimate - A consent-based siting process must not just be the policy of the Department of Energy, but the law of the land.

7) Balanced- Consent will require sharing of power among federal executive and legislative branches, and state and local governments and communities. Negotiating and decision-making power must be shared among affected federal, state and local entities, including those in the transportation sector. States also should be granted some authority over regulation of the facility.

8) Flexible - Consent can be withdrawn. The consent-based siting process must provide ample opportunity and defined moments to correct course or completely withdrawal from the siting process.

9) Contractual - States, tribes and communities must have clear recourse if the terms of consent are breached.

10) Tailored – The consent process must be responsive to each situation. While these common elements should be applied to any consent-based process, any approach must be tailored to the specific, unique needs of the particular state, tribe and communities where a waste dump is being considered.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

eric nicholson

97405

From: Olga Rassau [rassau@yosemite.net]
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2016 6:11 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment

I support the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future's recommendation to implement an explicitly adaptive, staged and consent-based approach to nuclear waste disposal. And I welcome the opportunity provided by the U.S. Department of Energy to submit comments on the agency's nascent effort to design a consent-based siting process.

Achieving consent-based siting, if done right, could lay the foundation for a fair and just process for siting a nuclear waste management facility that will well position the federal government – after decades of failure – to meet its nuclear waste management commitments and begin to restore the loss of trust and confidence in its ability to find a viable and permanent solution to our waste crisis.

I support and urge the DOE to apply the following 10 Criteria for Community Consent:

1) Informed - Communities must know what they are consenting to at each stage of the process. Early and often public engagement activities should offer the public, community leaders, experts and agency representatives frequent opportunities to exchange information. Information must be accessible and offered through a variety of platforms. The full range of cost and risks associated with the project must be disclosed and verified, as well as alternatives being considered. Achieving informed consent is not an end, but an ongoing exercise that responds to new information and findings as well as new generations.

2) Inclusive - Consent should be granted by those most impacted, including states, tribes and communities. A broad range of state, tribal and local stakeholders should be included in the decision-making process, and efforts must be made to increase the number of community members who recognize themselves and their communities as stakeholders in the siting process. People and entities that would financially benefit from the siting process should be clearly disclosed.

3) Collaborative - Consent can't be achieved through a top-down process. Activities related to outreach, engagement and education must be planned in coordination with appropriate stakeholders. Any agreements or decision-making must result from mutual input and understanding, and must be responsive to the concerns of citizens.

4) Just - Consent should not be bought. Financial compensation and other incentives must be reasonable, not used as coercion, and negotiated with full public disclosure.

5) Transparent - Consent must be pursued through an open process. Consent can be achieved and maintained through trust. Open access to information includes disclosure of funding and any conflicts of interest with the sources of information. All meetings, hearings and communications must be open to the public and on record.

6) Legitimate - A consent-based siting process must not just be the policy of the Department of Energy, but the law of the land.

7) Balanced- Consent will require sharing of power among federal executive and legislative branches, and state and local governments and communities. Negotiating and decision-making power must be shared among affected federal, state and local entities, including those in the transportation sector. States also should be granted some authority over regulation of the facility.

8) Flexible - Consent can be withdrawn. The consent-based siting process must provide ample opportunity and defined moments to correct course or completely withdrawal from the siting process.

9) Contractual - States, tribes and communities must have clear recourse if the terms of consent are breached.

10) Tailored – The consent process must be responsive to each situation. While these common elements should be applied to any consent-based process, any approach must be tailored to the specific, unique needs of the particular state, tribe and communities where a waste dump is being considered.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Olga Rassau

95338

From: Scott Teel [scottkl@twcny.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 12, 2016 9:00 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment

I support the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future's recommendation to implement an explicitly adaptive, staged and consent-based approach to nuclear waste disposal. And I welcome the opportunity provided by the U.S. Department of Energy to submit comments on the agency's nascent effort to design a consent-based siting process.

Achieving consent-based siting, if done right, could lay the foundation for a fair and just process for siting a nuclear waste management facility that will well position the federal government – after decades of failure – to meet its nuclear waste management commitments and begin to restore the loss of trust and confidence in its ability to find a viable and permanent solution to our waste crisis.

I support and urge the DOE to apply the following 10 Criteria for Community Consent:

1) Informed - Communities must know what they are consenting to at each stage of the process. Early and often public engagement activities should offer the public, community leaders, experts and agency representatives frequent opportunities to exchange information. Information must be accessible and offered through a variety of platforms. The full range of cost and risks associated with the project must be disclosed and verified, as well as alternatives being considered. Achieving informed consent is not an end, but an ongoing exercise that responds to new information and findings as well as new generations.

2) Inclusive - Consent should be granted by those most impacted, including states, tribes and communities. A broad range of state, tribal and local stakeholders should be included in the decision-making process, and efforts must be made to increase the number of community members who recognize themselves and their communities as stakeholders in the siting process. People and entities that would financially benefit from the siting process should be clearly disclosed.

3) Collaborative - Consent can't be achieved through a top-down process. Activities related to outreach, engagement and education must be planned in coordination with appropriate stakeholders. Any agreements or decision-making must result from mutual input and understanding, and must be responsive to the concerns of citizens.

4) Just - Consent should not be bought. Financial compensation and other incentives must be reasonable, not used as coercion, and negotiated with full public disclosure.

5) Transparent - Consent must be pursued through an open process. Consent can be achieved and maintained through trust. Open access to information includes disclosure of funding and any conflicts of interest with the sources of information. All meetings, hearings and communications must be open to the public and on record.

6) Legitimate - A consent-based siting process must not just be the policy of the Department of Energy, but the law of the land.

7) Balanced- Consent will require sharing of power among federal executive and legislative branches, and state and local governments and communities. Negotiating and decision-making power must be shared among affected federal, state and local entities, including those in the transportation sector. States also should be granted some authority over regulation of the facility.

8) Flexible - Consent can be withdrawn. The consent-based siting process must provide ample opportunity and defined moments to correct course or completely withdrawal from the siting process.

9) Contractual - States, tribes and communities must have clear recourse if the terms of consent are breached.

10) Tailored – The consent process must be responsive to each situation. While these common elements should be applied to any consent-based process, any approach must be tailored to the specific, unique needs of the particular state, tribe and communities where a waste dump is being considered.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Scott Teel

14850