

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Martha Izzo

Kinney Creek

Evergreen, CO 80439

From: Ray Spinka <fspinka@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 6:14 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Ray Spinka

Cardigan

26298 Cardigan Place

Redlands, CA 92374

From: George Yanney <gy234@webtv.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 5:51 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

George Yanney

916 S. Freedom Ave.

Alliance, OH 44601

From: Kate Daniel <writerkate@earthlink.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 5:46 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kate Daniel

Benson, AZ 85602

From: Ana Alvarez <aairis@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 5:39 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ana Alvarez

11500 Brandiwine Ct.

Clermont, FL 34711

From: Marilyn Kraker <mkraker@bazaareclectic.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 5:34 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Marilyn Kraker

2343 W. 22nd St.

2343 W. 22nd St.

Fremont, MI 49412

From: rachel chaput <rachel_chaput@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 5:31 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

rachel chaput

246 Hunters Lane

Dingmans Ferry, PA 18328

From: John H Anderson <anders17@ix.netcom.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 5:30 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

John H Anderson

4042 Albatross Apt 38

4042 Albatross, Apt 38

San Diego, CA 92103

From: David and Helen Gill <david.helen.gill@cox.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 5:24 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

David and Helen Gill

7108 Larrlyn Drive

Springfield, VA 22151

From: John and Martha Stoltenberg <jpstolten@frontier.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 4:48 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John and Martha Stoltenberg

N8362 State Highway 67

P.O. Box 596

Elkhart Lake, WI 53020

From: Philip Simon <philsimtpr@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 4:21 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Philip Simon

Box 9473

San Rafael, CA 94912

From: Oscar Revilla <oscarrevilla10@hotmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 3:56 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Oscar Revilla

Juan de Herrera

San Sebastian de los Reyes, ot 28024

From: Thomas Tizard <tizard8@hawaii.rr.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 3:50 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Thomas Tizard

591-A Keolu Drive

591-A Keolu Dr.

Kailua, HI 96734

From: k danowski <silver_kd@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 3:18 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

k danowski

15 bower hill road #801

pittsburgh, PA 15228

From: Patrick Russell <patrick6592@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 3:14 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Patrick Russell

6052 Chabot Rd. Apt. 10

Oakland, CA 94618

From: Lozi Gibbs <lozirivers@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 3:14 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lozi Gibbs

322 park

322

Whitethorn, CA 95589

From: Edward D Rasmussen <dean58us@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 3:08 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Edward D Rasmussen

702 Brighton Ave

702 brighton ave

Oregon City, OR 97045

From: Gary Jones <g.jones1965@att.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 3:05 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gary Jones

608 W. Marion St.

Joliet, IL 60436

From: Dave Ladd <cdcaladd2@bellsouth.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 3:00 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Dave Ladd

200 Beth St.

200 Beth St.

McEwen, TN 37101

From: Elliot Daniels <Elliot_Daniels@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 2:59 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Elliot Daniels

4633 S. 28th Rd

4633 s. 28th road

Arlington, VA 22206

From: Gail Breakey <gbreakey@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 2:57 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gail Breakey

94-1131 Mopua Loop H-2

Waipahu, HI 96797

From: Henry Schwartzman <unhotmail@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 2:33 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Henry Schwartzman

32 E. First St.

32 E. First St.

Corning, NY 14830

From: Elaine Fischer <efischer@workmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 2:26 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Elaine Fischer

2514 Sharmar Rd.

Roanoke, VA 24018

From: Alice Swan <aswan@rockisland.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 2:25 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Alice Swan

PO Box 1077

PO Box 1077

Eastsound, WA 98245

From: Lawrence Abbott <lawrencerabbott@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 2:21 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Abbott

433 Harlan St. #307

San Leandro, CA 94577

From: Jane Yater <jayater@texas.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 2:18 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jane Yater

2654 Barton Hills Drive

Austin, TX 78704

From: Howard Beeman <grandma@beeman.org>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 2:11 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Howard Beeman

21024 Road 95

Woodland, CA 95695

From: Matthew Lipschik <vze2xv5n@verizon.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 2:07 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Matthew Lipschik

1780 E. 13 St.

B'klyn., NY 11229

From: Mary Madison <Ericsb@verizon.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 2:05 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Madison

PA 19040

From: Francis Mancini <markeys@optonline.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 2:03 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Francis Mancini

PO Box 147

Glen Cove, NY 11542

From: Don McClure, Jr. <dmccjr@att.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 2:01 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Don McClure, Jr.

608 W. Green St. #3

Champaign, IL 61820

From: Jason Bowman <xyamuchax@care2.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 2:00 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jason Bowman

1525 Cold Springs Rd

SPC 52

Placerville, CA 95667

From: Robert Gabriel <doctorob@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:58 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Robert Gabriel

3125C 36th Ave NE

Olympia, WA 98506

From: Robert and Julia Kenny and Glover <synergy@whidbey.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:57 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Additionally, those responsible for hiding the serious radioactive leaks at Hanford should be prosecuted for endangering public health. That facility must be cleaned up immediately. Radioactive waste is already heading toward groundwater and will eventually contaminate the Columbi River, leading to extensive harm to the environment, animals and humans and to premature death.

Thank you for your consideration.

Robert and Julia Kenny and Glover

7292 Maxwellton Road

Clinton, WA 98236

From: Mary @. Stone <mary@4fast.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:53 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

As with CO2 emissions, we know radioactive waste is a problem we must deal with, effectively, now.

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mary @. Stone

11800 Hart Rd.

11800 Hart Rd.

Montague, CA 96064

From: Tara Bloyd <tara@quotidian.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:48 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Tara Bloyd

PO Box 818

Cerrillos, NM 87010

From: Kathleen Sanders <katsan@nethere.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:47 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Sanders

4131 Front St.

Apt. 104

San Diego, CA 92103

From: Jason Bowman <xyamuchax@care2.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:44 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Jason Bowman

1525 Cold Springs Rd

SPC 52

Placerville, CA 95667

From: Peter Roche <sunmtnsft@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:44 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Peter Roche

2916-C Avenida Alamosa

Santa Fe, NM 87507

From: Margaret Sellers <selldev@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:43 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Margaret Sellers

61 Red Bridge Rd

PO Box 802

N. Grosvenordale, CT 06255

From: Carol Patton <carol.patton@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:42 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Carol Patton

321 Rugby Ave

Kensington, CA 94708

From: Beth Angel <angel_computer_llc@hotmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:37 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Beth Angel

PO Box 118

Cobalt, CT 06424

From: Edith Coleman <ecol0106@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:37 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Edith Coleman

2600 Frederick Avenue

Wilmington, DE 19805

From: Elaine Fischer <efischer@workmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:36 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Elaine Fischer

2514 Sharmar Rd.

Roanoke, VA 24018

From: Lonn Holman <lonn-man@hotmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:31 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Lonn Holman

64 Meadow Ridge Ln

64 Meadow Ridge Way

Port Angeles, WA 98362

From: Patricia Orlinski <bikerpat@mindspring.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:28 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Patricia Orlinski

10511 W. Kingswood Circle

na

Sun City, AZ 85351

From: Kenneth Korten <kenkor@rain.org>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:26 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Korten

125 W. Micheltorena St. Apt.C

125 W. Micheltorena St. Apt. C , SB

Santa Barbara, CA 93101

From: Bruce Donnell <b_donnell@msn.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:24 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Bruce Donnell

11 Camino Crosby

Santa Fe, NM 87506

From: Henry Bennett <hankusb@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:20 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Henry Bennett

4014 SE Grant Court

Portland, OR 97214

From: AUGUST GERECKE <gerecke@surfside.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:17 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

AUGUST GERECKE

333 S Villanova Dr

CLAREMONT, CA 91711

From: Paola Medina-Diaz <pao2003@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:17 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Paola Medina-Diaz

Urb. Gran Vista 2 , 53 Plaza 6

53 Plaza 6

Gurabo 00778

From: Dennis Feichtinger <djfeich@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:16 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Dennis Feichtinger

2711 Riverside

Trenton, MI 48183

From: Janis Loveday <atharmony@sbbmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:16 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Janis Loveday

18376 Harmony Place

Grass Valley, CA 95949

From: Mark Battiste <mark.a.battiste@my.sfcollege.edu>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:15 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mark Battiste

427 S.W. 41st Street

Gainesville, FL 32607

From: Edh Stanley <itsEdh@softcom.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:13 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal-- It's a Bad Idea!

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Edh Stanley

5206 Sitton Way

5206 Sitton Way

Sacramento, CA 95823

From: Laurie Todd <Lauriet1357@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:11 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Laurie Todd

3756 SE Stephens St.

3756 SE Stephens St.

Portland, OR 97214

From: Alice McGough <wind333life@live.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:05 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Alice McGough

16 Nohono rd

Address Line 2

Mashpee, MA 02649

From: Lonn Holman <lonn-man@hotmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:04 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lonn Holman

64 Meadow Ridge Ln

64 Meadow Ridge Ln

Port Angeles, WA 98362

From: John Teevan <jptrugger@cox.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:03 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John Teevan

1136 Misty Creek Street

Chula Vista, CA 91913

From: Richard Katz <hce16@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:02 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Richard Katz

5412 Ireland St.

Las Vegas, NV 89149

From: William Young <popcultyoung@hotmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 1:00 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

William Young

1935 Quarry Road

Lynchburg, VA 24503

From: Carol Sawyers <sawyersc@hotmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:57 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Carol Sawyers

3710 Gross Rd

Spc 29

Santa Cruz, CA 95062

From: Sundra R Allen <sunathome@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:55 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Sundra R Allen

2

259 Wayne Ct

Salt Lake City, UT 84101

From: Dian Berger <dianberger@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:54 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dian Berger

5639 E. Gateway Dr.

Boise, ID 83716

From: Russ Berger <rgberger@cableone.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:54 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Russ Berger

5639 E. Gateway Dr.

Boise, ID 83716

From: John Teevan <jptrugger@cox.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:54 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

John Teevan

1136 Misty Creek St

Chula Vista, CA 91913

From: Lakshmi Maurizi <lakshmi119@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:51 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lakshmi Maurizi

Santa Rosa, CA 95401

From: Alan Savat <preppyhippie@calcentral.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:47 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Alan Savat

526 Second St

526 Second St

Santa Cruz, CA 95060

From: Margaret Welke <mwelke@tds.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:44 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Margaret Welke

410 Clemons Avenue

Madison, WI 53704

From: Jared Laiti <jared.laiti@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:38 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Jared Laiti

81 Cognac Circle

Sacramento, CA 95835

From: David Sanders <actiondave72@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:35 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Sanders

2022 Driftstone Drive

Glendora, CA 91740

From: Patsy Lowe <patsylowe@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:34 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Patsy Lowe

65 Bonanza Rd

942 Breton Ave

Palm Springs, CA 92262

From: Bob Fischella <fischellab@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:28 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Bob Fischella

6219 E. Via De La Yerba

Tucson, AZ 85750

From: Dea Maurizi <angeladea@att.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:25 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dea Maurizi

1821 Fenwick Pl.

Santa Rosa, CA 95401

From: Cosima Krueger-Cunningham <cardamomseed@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:21 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Cosima Krueger-Cunningham

977 7th Street

Boulder, CO 80302

From: Andy Lupenko <fccsd@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:21 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Andy Lupenko

8555 Golden Avenue

Lemon Grove, CA 91945

From: marc silverman <dhalgrn@pacbell.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:19 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,
marc silverman

6030 graciosa dr

6030 Graciosa Drive

la, CA 90068

From: Maryellen Redish <mredish@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:18 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Maryellen Redish

671 S. Riverside Dr. #6

671 S. Riverside Dr. #6

Palm Springs, CA 92264

From: Virginia Harris <gngr8s@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:17 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Addressing our nation's radioactive waste problem should be a very high priority. However, the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would exacerbate, not solve, the problem of how to deal with our nation's high-level radioactive waste.

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Virginia Harris

9932 Litzsinger Road

St. Louis, MO 63124

From: Jeffrey Hollar <jahollar@hotmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:15 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeffrey Hollar

362 E Reservoir Rd

Woodstock, VA 22664

From: Martha Spencer <spencer_martha@hotmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:14 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Martha Spencer

988 Henry Mountain Road

Brevard, NC 28712

From: Rebecca Lord <mosa@rapidnet.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:12 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Rebecca Lord

PO Box 952

PO Box 952

Hill City, SD 57745

From: Madeline Shapiro <madrshap@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:07 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that. I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative. Thank you for your consideration.

Madeline Shapiro

9816 Maryknoll Ave.

9816 Maryknoll Ave.

Whittier, CA 90605

From: Rob Nash <JBGNM@Hotmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:05 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Rob Nash

8754 River st ne

Creek st ne

Albuquerque, NM 87110

From: Marc Silverman <Dhalgrn@pacbell.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:05 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Marc Silverman

6030 graciosa drive

6030 GRACIOSA DRIVE

la, CA 90068

From: Lynn Williamson <PLGW@MSN.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:04 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Lynn Williamson

11 Inverness rd

Creek st ne

Falmouth, ME 04105

From: C Nast <canast@wizwire.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:04 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

C Nast

20860 Indian Dr

20860 Indian Dr

Colfax, CA 95713

From: Marcia Robinson <marrobin36@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:02 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Marcia Robinson

3 Peter Cooper Road

Apt. #11H

New York, NY 10010

From: Katherine Farago <kitf@cox.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:00 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Katherine Farago

623 W Guadalupe #144

Mesa, AZ 85210

From: Philip Noel <philipnoel9@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:00 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration

Philip Noel

1142 Tulip Ct

San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

From: Mercedita del Valle <bernardmercy38@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:00 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Mercedita del Valle

102 N. Rhododendron Dr.

Port Townsend, WA 98368

From: Katharine Nigh <kippynigh@mac.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Katharine Nigh

3198 Fallen Leaf Street

Palo Alto, CA 94303

From: Stuart M <morkabu@aim.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Stuart M

7710 31st Ave NW

7710 31st Ave NW

Seattle, WA 98117

From: annnette paquet <annettepaquet@att.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

annnette paquet

5131 del mar mesa rd.

5131 del mar mesa rd

s.d., CA 92130

From: Elke Hoppenbrouwers <ehoppenbrouwers@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Elke Hoppenbrouwers

152 Allison Way

152 Allison Way

East Haven, CT 06512

From: sarah-marie belcastro <smbelcas@toroidalsnark.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

sarah-marie belcastro

278 Bay Road

11 Jewett St.

Hadley, MA 01035

From: Grace van Thillo <gracea@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Grace van Thillo

120 Avenida San Pablo

San Clemente, CA 92672

From: Carleton Vickers <carvik@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Carleton Vickers

12201 Nutmeg Ln

Reston, VA 20191

From: J. Gregory Twain <gtwain@netscape.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

J. Gregory Twain

1422 SE 34th Ave

Portland, OR 97214

From: Nick Bruno <dnickbruno@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Nick Bruno

POB 31783

Apt D304

Seattle, WA 98103

From: Robert Leroux <robtleroux@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Robert Leroux

1210 DELTA AVENUE

Apartment One

Cincinnati, OH 45208

From: cletus stein <cletus@arn.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

cletus stein

5113 sw 16th

5113 SW 16th

amarillo, TX 79106

From: Mary Schor <maryschor@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Schor

10320 Westlake Dr., Apt 305

10320 Westlake Dr., Apt. 305

Bethesda, MD 20817

From: Carol Klingsmith <ccklingsmith@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Carol Klingsmith

624 N Kansas

Marceline, MO 64658

From: Kevin Mathewson <kmathewson@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kevin Mathewson

31 Park Terrace West

Apr. F-8

New York, NY 10034

From: Christine Holmstrom <ckholmstrom@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Christine Holmstrom

Fairoaks, CA 95628

From: RONALD RICHARDSON <RONJERI@IOWATELECOM.NET>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

RONALD RICHARDSON

3014 NORWALK LANE

none

MISSOURI VALLEY, IA 51555

From: Judy Phillips <judy-dharma@crocker.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Judy Phillips

482 Orange Rd

Northfield, MA 01360

From: Mary Jo Brinker <naacmail@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Jo Brinker

161 Leonhardt Lane

Leonhardt Lane

Ellwood City, PA 16117

From: Michael Seager <michael_seager@att.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michael Seager

8253 Westmoor Road

Mentor, OH 44060

From: Scott Cady <sd925@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Scott Cady

5652 Pillsbury Ave S

Minneapolis, MN 55419

From: Minister Dahniayl Benyahmeen <dbenyahmeen@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Minister Dahniayl Benyahmeen

Box 1061

Flagstaff, AZ 86001

From: Kay Schaser <bkshaz@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Kay Schaser

2701 Erie Street

2701 Erie Street

Eureka, CA 95501

From: Frances Sowa <frannevpk@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Frances Sowa

2742 W. 97th Place

N.A.

Evergreen Park, IL 60805

From: Chip Henneman <ww2buff39_45@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Chip Henneman

3117 Orson F Dr

Layton, UT 84040

From: James Edward Heck <nمبر1flyingace@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

James Edward Heck

1300 Decatur St.

Richmond, VA 23224

From: Lee Terbot <terbot@att.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Lee Terbot

7 La Piedra Blanca

Santa Fe, NM 87508

From: Jon Hager <stormcrow60@xmission.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Jon Hager

11760 S. 1300 W.

Riverton, UT 84065

From: Maya Kurtz <mayachristine@ymail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Maya Kurtz

336 Park

Glenwood Springs, CO 81601

From: Jane Leatherman Van Praag <jlvanpraag@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Jane Leatherman Van Praag

P. O. Box 354

9361 N TX HWY 95

Bartlett, TX 76511

From: JUSTINE TILLEY <spiritsoncall063@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

JUSTINE TILLEY

3201 Sawtelle Blvd.

3201 Sawtell Blvd

Los Angeles, CA 23602

From: Eduardo Gandolfo <gandolfsea@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Eduardo Gandolfo

125 Aliilani Pl

Kihei, HI 96753

From: Felicity Hohenshelt <Licy75@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Felicity Hohenshelt

11326 Carlsburg Ct.

Jacksonville, FL 32246

From: Nancy Wall <nanwll@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Nancy Wall

3547 E. Elida

3547 E. Elida

Tucson, AZ 85716

From: Dr. William J. Sneck, S.J., Ph.D. <Bsneck@jesuitcenter.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dr. William J. Sneck, S.J., Ph.D.

501 N. Church Rd.

Wernersville,, PA 19565

From: Gabriel Kiley <gabekiley@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Gabriel Kiley

1222 palou ave.

2448 Mission st.

San Francisco, CA 94124

From: Kay Patrick <xrnonxi@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Kay Patrick

1457 Ben Annie Rd

Gretna, VA 24557

From: glenda Gloss <fusioninx@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

glenda Gloss

NDCBU 6994

ndcbu 6994

Taos, NM 87571

From: Denise Kobylarz <denisekoby@optonline.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Denise Kobylarz

313 Newark Pompton Turnpike

Pequannock, NJ 07440

From: Patrick Bosold <bosolds@lisco.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Patrick Bosold

202 N. 5th St.

Fairfield, IA 52556

From: Nancy R. Griffith <rahijasaad@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nancy R. Griffith

1120 44th Street

Sacramento, CA 95819

From: Wanda Ballentine <wsb70@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Wanda Ballentine

1181 Edgcumbe Rd. 314

1359 Chatterton Rd.

St. Paul, MN 55105

From: Ineke Way <inekew786@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ineke Way

1938 Oakland Dr

Kalamazoo, MI 49008

From: Cathy Holt <cathyholt@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Cathy Holt

84 Vance Crescent Ext.

Asheville, NC 28806

From: Jan Kampa <happykampas@cruzio.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jan Kampa

3120 Hardin Way

Soquel, CA 95073

From: Dominick Falzone <dominick3@roadrunner.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dominick Falzone

745 S. Normandie Ave. Apt. 108

Los Angeles, CA 90005

From: Julie Hoefnagels <jmrhoefnagels@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Julie R. Hoefnagels

Boise, ID

Julie Hoefnagels

5402 W. Hill Rd.

Boise, ID 83703

From: Ineke Deruyter <ideruyter@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ineke Deruyter

9322 N. Oswego Ave

9322 N. Oswego Ave

Portland, OR 97203

From: Michael Zmolek <mike.zmolek@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michael Zmolek

707 S 20 Ave W

707 S 20 Ave W, Newton, IA 50208

Newton, IA 52240

From: Christopher Lish <lishchris@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Christopher Lish

PO Box 113

Olema, CA 94950

From: Lucius Chiaraviglio <lchiarav@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

The radioactive waste problem should receive high priority attention. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lucius Chiaraviglio

1618 Beacon Street #1

Brookline, MA 02446

From: Beverly Miller <atomvb1@netzero.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Beverly Miller

5725 Ridgeway Dr

5725 Ridgeway Dr.

haslett, MI 48840

From: Wayne Pipke <pipman77-news@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

It is time to begin the process of decommissioning our nuclear plants and move to safer energy production.

Thank you for your consideration.

Wayne Pipke

41 Fern St.

41 Fern St.

Rocky Hill, CT 06067

From: Travis Wirt <traviswirt@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Travis Wirt

HC78, Box 253 B

Pipestem, WV 25979

From: Judith Garson <jgarson@rscj.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

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

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

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. For the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Judith Garson

501 W 52 St

Apt 4E

New York, NY 10019

From: Andy McNutt <wamcnutt@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Andy McNutt

5815 Orchard Creek Lane

Boulder, CO 80301

From: Alan Somers <also80@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Alan Somers

25144 SW 17th Ave.

Newberry, FL 32669

From: James Stone <choice@choiceimaging.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

James Stone

155 S 4th St

Santa Rosa Beach, FL 32459

From: Lynn Fischer <fish009@bellsouth.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lynn Fischer

11605 NE 10 Ave.

Miami, FL 33161

From: Tom Nasta <Jnasta@pfplans.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Tom Nasta

24440 Charing Cross Drive

Roanoke, VA 24018

From: Ben Gumpertz <geront@surewest.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Ben Gumpertz

8112 Falcon View Drive

none

Antelope, CA 95843

From: Alice GearySgroi <aandpsgroi@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Alice GearySgroi

11127 Patrina Court

11127 Patrina Court

St. Louis, MO 63126

From: Alvia Lewis <alvia_lewis@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Alvia Lewis

780 Bellwood Road

Hampton, VA 23666

From: Damian Fontanez <latinomagico2626@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Damian Fontanez

3558 W.127th street

3558 West 127th street

Cleveland, OH 44111

From: Phyllis Miller <phylmil14@bellsouth.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Miller

2394 Leafgate Rd

Decatur, GA 30033

From: mary izett <mwizett@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mary Izett

12 Cerro Encantado

n/a

Lafayette, CA 94549

From: John Lynn <tricyrtis@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

John Lynn

8 Banks Court

PO Box 643

East Hampton, NY 11937

From: Joe Persinger <docp@sonic.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Joe Persinger

736 Eastside Avenue

736 Eastside Avenue

Sebastopol, CA 95472

From: Ellen Fox <slyasa@nyc.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ellen Fox

106 Fort Washington Avenue

New York, NY 10032

From: Ace Strife <blindjudgement@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Ace Strife

10 Highfield Road

Flanders, NJ 07836

From: Morgan Clark <morgan.cl@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Morgan Clark

203 Academy St

South Orange, NJ 07079

From: Leo Waters <leoandamy@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Leo Waters

22 High Street

Sharon, MA 02067

From: Alan J Nishman <jodypenny@crocker.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Alan J Nishman

23 O'Neil Rd

Haydenville, MA 01039

From: Henry Berkowitz <hlemc@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Henry Berkowitz

141 Sperry Rd

none

Sabinsville, PA 16943

From: Tim White <tl.white@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Tim White

104 Green Mountain Road

Effingham, NH 03882

From: Mark Heald <mheald@frontiernet.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Mark Heald

PO Box 284

Pleasant Hill, TN 38578

From: jeannie roberts <jeannier@tds.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

jeannie roberts

1004 yale rd

madison, WI 53705

From: Betty Root <broot@wowway.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Betty Root

9302 McCracken Blvd

ClevelandOH, OH 44125

From: Jane Chischilly <claygoddess541@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Jane Chischilly

POB 1285

420A Tombstone Cyn.

Bisbee, AZ 85603

From: Gail Ryall <gryall@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gail Ryall

1065 Westward Way

Sacramento, CA 95833

From: James Koss <jameskoss@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

THERE IS NO SAFE LEVEL OF RADIATION FOR LIVING BEINGS, NEITHER HUMAN NOR ANIMAL

DO WE NEED MORE CANCER AND BIRTH DEFECTS?

MEDICAL RADIATION FROM X-RAYS AND CT SCANS HAVE ALREADY DOUBLED BACKGROUND RADIATION
IN THE US

NEED WE ADD MORE?

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

James Koss

P. O. BOX 70918

P. O. BOX 70918

Richmond, CA 94501

From: Nancy Ranieri <peacebeach@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Nancy Ranieri

1647 Aidenn Lair Road

Dresher, PA 19025

From: Al Fatemi <mir7094@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Al Fatemi

1687 NW division St

P O Box 53

Corvallis, OR 97330

From: Jane Young <connieyoung@mac.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jane Young

PO Box 85

Aiken, SC 29801

From: Erica Hulstrom <ejhulstrom@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Erica Hulstrom

1003 Warbonnett Dr.

Perris, CA 92570

From: Carolyn moon <carcar@att.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carolyn moon

120 S 38th AV #24

120 S 38th Av #24

Omaha, NE 68131

From: Lake Barrett <Lake@Lbarrett.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Sustainable Fuel Cycle Task Force Science Panel Comments on Draft Nuclear Waste Bill

Attachments: Executive_Summary_Barrett_Sustainable_Fuel_Cycle_Science_Panel.doc; Question 1_Barrett_Science Panel.doc; Question 5_Barrett_Science Panel.doc; Question2_Barrett_Science Panel.doc; Question3_Barrett_Science Panel.doc; Question4_Barrett_Science Panel.doc; Question6_Barrett_Science Panel.doc; Question7_Barrett_Science Panel.doc; Question 8_Barrett_Science Panel.doc

Per your website instructions, please find attached our letter input on the Draft Bill in your Executive Summary template form.

We also have attached our responses to each question in your requested templates.

If you have any questions or please let us know.

Lake Barrett

Sustainable Fuel Cycle Science Panel Facilitator

941-445-4873

Lake@Lbarrett.com

From: Katherine Robinson <katherine.robinson.architect@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Katherine Robinson

48 High Street #18

Methuen, MA 01844

From: Margaret Sellers <selldev@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Margaret Sellers

61 Red Bridge Rd

PO Box 802

N. Grosvenordale, CT 06255

From: Margaret Sellers <selldev@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Margaret Sellers

61 Red Bridge Rd

PO Box 802

N. Grosvenordale, CT 06255

From: Umi Hagitani <amnioticfluid@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Umi Hagitani

2824, E 9th St

Oakland, CA 94601

From: Julie Ford <jford29105@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Julie Ford

16222 Monterey Lane #223

Huntington Beach, CA 92649

From: esther lawson <laws6398@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

esther lawson

2334 black oak way

ashland, OR 97520

From: Ruben Tamamian <rubentamamian@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ruben Tamamian

2651 Koa ave

Morro bay, CA 93442

From: GLORIA J HOWARD <gjhoward1@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

GLORIA J HOWARD

12425 NORTH DERRINGER ROAD

N/A

MARANA, AZ 85653

From: Barry Hood <televideos@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Unacceptable Nuclear waste draft

I am writing because I am totally opposed to interim storage of radioactive wastes. I am in favor of on-site hard storage. Interim storage simply gives more opportunities for something to go wrong. And with concentrated nuclear materials, there simply is no margin for error to trust that there will not be some future problem placing material in interim storage.

Barry Hood

1566 dola st

eugene, OR 97402

From: Patrick Conley <pconleyc@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Given the fundamental selfishness of people and a notorious instability in human culture and the greed driving private interests controlling the nuclear industry nuclear power, we are going to have a catastrophic accident relatively soon, largely as a result of putting profits ahead of plant safety. In addition by the estimate of the New York Academy of Science almost a million people have died as a result of Chernoble alone. The industry needs to be shut down as they are doing in Germany, but as in so many arenas corporate takes the cake and we as population get to absorb the poisonous dregs of nuclear power. you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Patrick Conley

7527 Lone Eagle Drive

Murfreesboro, TN 37128

From: Shannon Mortela <themortelas@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Shannon Mortela

19050 Uvas Rd

Morgan Hill, CA 95037

From: Martha Milne <milnemw@netzero.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Martha Milne

1764 Braman Av.

Fort Myers, FL 33901

From: JENIFER MASSEY <jifmassey@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

JENIFER MASSEY

211 AVENIDA VALENCIA

211 AVENIDA VALENCIA

SAN CLEMENTE, CA 92672

From: Marian Cooley <mariancooley@att.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Marian Cooley

1400 N. Woodridge

1400 N. Woodridge

Muncie, IN 47304

From: JoEllen Davis <jedavis@cableone.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

JoEllen Davis

1215 E Vista Circle

1215 Vista Cir

Globe, AZ 85501

From: Thomas Koven <kombi3@embarqmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Thomas Koven

507 charlestown road

507 charlestown rd

Hampton, NJ 08827

From: JENIFER MASSEY <jifmassey@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

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

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

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

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

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

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

JENIFER MASSEY

211 AVENIDA VALENCIA

211 AVENIDA VALENCIA

SAN CLEMENTE, CA 92672

From: Eleanor Fox <efox@rscj.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

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

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Eleanor Fox

406 E. 80th St.

New York, NY 10075

From: Sibylle Schwarz <ssn@rupertsland.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sibylle Schwarz

P.O.Box: 6099

Eagle River, AK 99577

From: Gerson Lesser <gtl1@nyu.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gerson Lesser

5800 Arlington Ave.

Bronx, NY 10471

From: Beverly Jahn <bevjahn@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Beverly Jahn

735 Vrain #210

Denver

Denver, CO 80204

From: John Lally <jjllc@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Lally

7 Cedar Lane

7 Cedar Lane

Croton on Hudson, NY 10520

From: Joseph Lite <quintley@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joseph Lite

1773 KING AVENUE

223 Northwood Drive

DAYTON, OH 45420

From: Ken Hayes <surfersanta@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ken Hayes

500 E Riverside Dr

Austin, TX 78704

From: Thomas Gilmore <tgilmore66@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Thomas Gilmore

317 Parkridge Rd

Bellingham, WA 98225

From: Rene Robert <Frene44@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rene Robert

1065 LIVE OAK LANE

1065 LIVE OAK LANE

St. John's, FL 32259

From: Edward Thornton <ert@sas.upenn.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Edward Thornton

7 Swarthmore Place

Swarthmore, PA 19081

From: Troy Leutz <t_leutz@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Troy Leutz

810 N. East Ave.

Jackson, MI 49202

From: Mary Mathews <timmary747@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mary Mathews

1111 S Waukegan Rd

1111 S Waukegan Rd

Lake Forest, IL 60045

From: Jon Spitz <plantbased.js@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jon Spitz

401 Steele Lane

Laytonville, CA 95454

From: john cevasco <johncevasco@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

john cevasco

596 millers falls rd.,p.o.box 78

596 millers falls rd.,p.o.box 78

northfield, MA 01360

From: William Epp <political@wrepp.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

William Epp

120 Adams Blvd.

Terre Haute, IN 47803

From: Marjorie Worthington <maworth@skynetbb.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Marjorie Worthington

1947 Clovercrest Street

Enumclaw, WA 98022

From: Judi Poulson <judpeace@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Judi Poulson

1881 Knollwood Drive

Fairmont, MN 56031

From: S Siegner <ssiegner@q.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

S Siegner

9640 SW Lancaster Rd

na

Portland, OR 97219

From: Roberta Paro <raparo@snet.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Your "discussion draft" does not focus on public health, environmental protection, or equity for the future. Please start over.

Sincerely,

Roberta Paro

246A Yantic Street

246A Yantic Street

Norwich, CT 06360

From: Craig Pearson <cpcntst@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Craig Pearson

3102 Furman Lane Apt 401

Apt 401

Alexandria, VA 22306

From: Megan Boissiere <mboissie@capital.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Megan Boissiere

979 white oak court

Marysville, OH 43215

From: Deborah Wagner <dwagner0602@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Deborah Wagner

198 Market St

Brookeville, MD 20833

From: Sarah Lanzman <lanzman.sarah@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sarah Lanzman

1784 Simmons Gap Rd.:

Dyke, VA 22935

From: Lee Sakkas <lee.sakkas@marist.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lee Sakkas

360 W 8th Ave

Truth or Consequences, NM 87901

From: Lisa Gosnell <eotas@mchsi.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lisa Gosnell

24536 Marsh Hawk Lane

Georgetown, DE 19947

From: Dorothy Johnson <nursejohnson25@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dorothy Johnson

5849 Rockdale Court

Centreville, VA 20121

From: ordell vee <otvee@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

ordell vee

427 2nd st. n.e.

427 2nd st. n.e.

Madelia, MN 56062

From: john cevasco <johncevasco@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

john cevasco

596 millers falls rd;

p.o.box 78

northfield, MA 01360

From: Donna Charter <charter3@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Donna Charter
1209 Thannisch Ct
1209 Thannisch Ct
Arlington, TX 76011

From: Nathan Hetrick <hetricknathan@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nathan Hetrick
10021 Ray Road

Apartment 409

Gaines, MI 48436

From: Lee Lindsey <lee_lindsey2001@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lee Lindsey

19002 Rion Hill Ct.

Cypress, TX 77429

From: Pat Johnson <pawjohnson@wideopenwest.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Pat Johnson

864 Lakefield Drive

Galloway, OH 43119

From: phil vanasse <pava58@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

phil vanasse

16 colonial court

High Bridge, NJ 08829

From: Robin Lorentzen <rlorentzen@collegeofidaho.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Robin Lorentzen

14250 Chicken Dinner Road

Caldwell, ID 83607

From: Constance Del Nero <italophile13@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radioactive waste is dangerous!

I am very worried about radioactive waste! Dealing with it should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Constance Del Nero

610 South St

Easton, MD 21601

From: Dorothy Gualco <edgu@surewest.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dorothy Gualco

120 Middleton Way

120 Middleton Way

Sacramento, CA 95864

From: Paul Szymanowski <pszymanowski@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Paul Szymanowski

P.O. Box 74

Curtice, OH 43412

From: Carol Gilbert-Sacks <carolsacks53@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Carol Gilbert-Sacks

193 Brookwood Dr

Charlottesville, VA 22902

From: Barbara Cowan <barbarac337@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Barbara Cowan

5 Roberts Road #3

Cambridge, MA 02138

From: Philip Heinlein <pdheinlein@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Philip Heinlein

923 S. Main St.

Summerville, SC 29483

From: January Boudart <j-boudart@northwestern.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: It's time to re-evaluate our Nuclear Waste Management lack of a plan

The following comments have to do with already generated nuclear waste .

I do not support nuclear power with it's generation of more nuclear waste. I will continue to be against the building or continuation of any nuclear plant anywhere in the world. Also, I am horrified at the prospect of 4th (or its it 3rd?) generation small nuclear reactors with their sodium-cooled reactor cores. What can the scientist possibly be thinking? Their engineers should inform the scientists that sooner or later the sodium will come through those pipes and start a fire.

Please clear out the low-density pools within 5 years so that new radiation rods can be put into the pools without crowding. Either new pools must be built so the rods don't have to be moved or a method of storing them in low density while dry will have to be found. I think it has already been found and must now be implemented.

Transportation of nuclear waste would be a huge mistake. It is already too distributed upon the earth. Too many people are already at risk. What if your family lives near a transportation channel -- an interstate, a railroad track, a port? You will not even be informed that this dangerous material is going by. Of course the public can't be told because there would be huge protests and the whole process of transporting it would be stymied by protesters' live bodies in the way. Thus, I believe that Hardened On-Site Storage, regarded as permanent, should be the way to handle this. The Finns (from Finland) are developing ways to warn future generations of the danger lurking in storage areas. I believe that if pictures of the horrible human and animal birth defects cause by nuclear waste were engraved into the rocks around a nuclear storage site, people would be warned off -- now and in the future. (Maybe we don't have the courage to tell the public the truth about that.)

About Hardened On-Site Storage: The requirements for somewhat-safe (since none of it is "safe") storage have been explained in detail in other submissions to this hearing. I accept the recommendations of the Nuclear Information Resource Service (NIRS) and the Nuclear Energy Information Service (NEIS). They have taken the time to think this through and I recommend their work to the committee. Briefly, they suggest protection of fuel pools, frequent review of HOSS facilities and fuel pools, Federal funding for localities harboring this extremely dangerous material. (Here I have trouble staying with just the waste. What about areas where Uranium is mined. They need money for mitigation of its effects. Sorry.)

Last, I must say that re-processing should be forbidden. The process of extracting the "useful" waste is dangerous, you still have to do something with the isotopes of uranium, plutonium and other elements

that are not going to be used, and you're just creating more stuff to make bombs with. Not only that, the French nuclear waste is stored in Siberia in the form of uranium hexafluoride. 1) I can scarcely imagine a more dangerous compound (fluorine, for gosh sakes) and 2) as global warming progresses Siberia will be prime real estate. Placing the storage areas in a low-density population area could well come back and bite the planners (you know where).

From: Lynn Cardiff <lcardiff@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lynn Cardiff

2625 Englewood Ave NE

none

Salem, OR 97301

From: Randy Morrow <rockjockdj@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Randy Morrow

1309 S. Pershing

1309 S. Pershing

Wichita, KS 67218

From: Catherine Quigg <catherineq26@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Catherine Quigg

838 Harriet Ln.

barrington IL 60010

Barrington, IL 60005

From: Laurie Solomon <star_fire145@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Laurie Solomon

POB 1342

Battle Ground, WA 98604

From: Joseph Bateman <seagel_inc@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joseph Bateman

975 E 400 S

Apt. 18

Salt Lake City, UT 84101

From: paul stein <nanothermite911@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

paul stein

532 LaGuardia Pl

NY, NY 10012

From: James Thomas <jmichaelthomas2001@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Thomas

5900 Hathaway Lane

North Carolina

Chapel Hill, NC 27514

From: Jane Chischilly <claygoddess541@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jane Chischilly

POB 1285

POB 1285

Bisbee, AZ 85603

From: Ruth Busch <betzy@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ruth Busch

6079 County Road 290

Lafayette, AL 36862

From: Bruce Burns <everythingcrash@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bruce Burns

108 Westmoor Ct.

Santa Cruz, CA 95060

From: Ruth Bescrypt <rainbow26@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ruth Bescript

8882 E Maxwell Dr

Tucson, AZ 85747

From: THELMA COOGLER <holliswatkins@att.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

THELMA COOGLER

HOLLAND-SYLVANIA RD

TOLEDO, OH 43623

From: Donald Walsh <djw411@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Donald Walsh

323 Buchanan St

323 Buchanan St

Alexandria, VA 22314

From: John Light <johandmol@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Light

1138 N. Taylor Street

Arlington, VA 22201

From: Jay Smith <bureau165@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jay Smith

P.O. Box 330851

Miami, FL 33233

From: Gayle Bettega <gayle.bettega@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gayle Bettega

1991 Dorothea Rd.

Berkley, MI 48072

From: Dennis Hartenstine <Ranger2646@live.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dennis Hartenstine

Hollow Point Homestead

2425 Hay Creek Road

Birdsboro, PA 19508

From: Teresa Jaeger <iotlj@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Teresa Jaeger

13316 Summerton Dr

Orlando, FL 32824

From: Gaella Elwell <gaella.elwell@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gaella Elwell

888 Shelburne Falls RD

Conway, MA 01341

From: Anita Brandariz <Anna12lago16@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Anita Brandariz

13 Willow Place

Brooklyn, NY 11201

From: Rebecca McDonough <beckymcdonough@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rebecca McDonough

455 San Mateo Drive

Menlo Park, CA 94025

From: Mike LaPorte <mikeclaporte@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mike LaPorte

6488 SW Midmar Place

Portland, OR 97223

From: Roberta Schonemann <schonem@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Roberta Schonemann

4515 Erwin Road

West Lafayette, IN 47906

From: Liz J <lizatdans@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Liz J

908 Fillmore St

Albany, CA 94706

From: Mary Levendos <marylevendos@webtv.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Levendos

5315 Cribari Gln

5315 Cribari Glen

San Jose, CA 95135

From: Joe Serpico <jserpico@tampabay.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joe Serpico

4215 E Bay Dr 1507A

Clearwater, FL 33764

From: Richard Hamlen <hamlens1@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Richard Hamlen

4047 Overlook Trail Dr

Roanoke, VA 24018

From: Timothy O'Connell <Oconnell108@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Timothy O'Connell

415 Sherri ave

Falls Chrch, VA 22046

From: James O'Flaherty <autosculptor@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

James O'Flaherty

3011 Sweet Briar

Grapevine, TX 776051-263

From: Madeline Studer <madgestuder@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Madeline Studer

170 Good Counsel Drive

170 Good Counsel Drive

Mankato, MN 56001

From: Patricia McDonald <patmcdonald@cfl.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patricia McDonald

2348 Summerfield Road

Winter Park, FL 32792

From: SADIE GEORGE <SVAILSMISSISSIPPI@GMAIL.COM>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

SADIE GEORGE

JOHN F KENNEDY BLVD

JACKSON, MS 39213

From: Karen Larson <Macbibee@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Karen Larson

6348 Eisenhower Ct.

Chino, CA 91710

From: Jan Hillegas <newmsian@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways -- even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome -- yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry -- which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution are imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jan Hillegas

PO Box 3234

Jackson, MS 39207

From: Romola Georgia <markhgeorgia@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Romola Georgia

3445 Tippawingo Drive

Palo Alto, CA 94306

From: HOLLIS WATKINS <hollisam51@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

HOLLIS WATKINS

109 Berry Dr

P O Box 1056

Clinton, MS 39060

From: Paul Vesper <Pontiffp@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Paul Vesper

1601 Berkeley Way

Berkeley, CA 94703

From: John Barfield <liesl1@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Barfield

5000 Old Shepard Place

Apt 1518

Plano, TX 75093

From: Ann Searing <annsearing@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ann Searing

483 Canton Ave

483 Canton Ave

Milton, MA 02186

From: Billie Watkins <jtppinc@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Billie Watkins

Box 1056

Clinton, MS 39060

From: Joseph Ponisciak <jppon4@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joseph Ponisciak

30 Nottingham Drive

30 Nottingham Drive

Willingboro, NJ 08046

From: Lynn Cardiff <lcardiff@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lynn Cardiff

2625 Englewood Ave NE

none

Salem, OR 97301

From: Francis Scheuer <citizen@fsmail.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Francis Scheuer

POB 1341

POB 1341

Sarasota, FL 34230

From: Patricia Orlinski <bikerpat@mindspring.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patricia Orlinski

10511 W. Kingswood Circle

na

Sun City, AZ 85351

From: Glen Benjamin <soulroll@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Glen Benjamin

140 Court Street apt 209

140 Court Street apt 209

Portsmouth, NH 03801

From: George Stadnik <gstadnik@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

George Stadnik

24-66 44 Street

Queens

Astoria, NY 11103

From: Jan Boudart <j-boudart@northwestern.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jan Boudart

1132 W. Lunt Ave.

Chicago, IL 60626

From: Ron Tergesen <rtergesen@optonline.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ron Tergesen

9 Simmons dr.

East Islip, NY 11730

From: Sibyll Gilbert <rg5285@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sibyll Gilbert

41 Game Farm Road

Pawling, NY 12564

From: KL Matlock <klmatlock@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

KL Matlock

895 E. Jackson St.

San Jose, CA 95112

From: harold meyer jr <hamnlwez@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

harold meyer jr

13 juniper meadow road

13 juniper meadow

washington depot, CT 06794

From: Donald Walsh <djw411@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Donald Walsh

323 Buchanan St

323 Buchanan St

Alexandria, VA 22314

From: Gertrude Carlson <vegastak@cs.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gertrude Carlson

235 Winona Drive

Henderson, NV 89015

From: Sheila Tracy <sheila.dawn50@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

It is necessary for our future generations to choose a solution that will protect the future health of the planet and the children yet to come.

Sincerely,

Sheila Dawn Tracy

Sheila Tracy

10450 Wheeler St.

Mendocino, CA 95460

From: Dana Ginn <DGinn92591@cs.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dana Ginn

31463 Britton Circle

Temecula, CA 92591

From: mark & susan glasser <mark7glasser@ca.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

mark & susan glasser

3660 barry ave

LA, CA 90088

From: Natalie Van Leekwijck <hoepagirl@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Natalie Van Leekwijck

Beaverton, OR 97005

From: Raymond Swierczynski <mondray2129@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Raymond Swierczynski

10 Hillside Terrace

Suffern

Suffern, NY 10901

From: Jean Westler <jeanwestler@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jean Westler

121 Blossom Dr

Winchester, VA 22602

From: Ed Miller <emiller2@nycap.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ed Miller

4 Arcadia Ave

4 Arcadia Ave

Albany, NY 12209

From: Joanne Sauter <chitowntall@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joanne Sauter

50 E 16th St

Chicago, IL 60626

From: Michael Carter <incandescent.dusk@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michael Carter

4263 SE Belmont St Apt 305

Apt 305

Portland, OR 97215

From: James Facette <jimface34@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Facette

121 Sawmill Rd

3500 Mountain Blvd

Dayton, OH 45409

From: Christian Heinold <cheinold@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Christian Heinold

547 24th St Apt 21

Oakland, CA 94612

From: sue colucci <sucolucci@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

sue colucci

7155 Hillside

Clarkston, MN 48346

From: Heidi Waddell <aslh111@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Heidi Waddell

100 Berkley Rd. Apt. 13

Verona, WI 53593

From: Sandrine Marten <cuji91307@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sandrine Marten

4104 magna Carta Rd

Calabasas, CA 91302

From: Angela Smith <enlitened@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Angela Smith

13641 26th Pl S

SeaTac, WA 98168

From: david prystal <dprystal@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

david prystal

191 bone hollow rd

accord, NM 12404

From: Walter Pelton <walter@fft.to>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Walter Pelton

8130 Lorraine Ave., #322

#322

Stockton, CA 95210

From: Edward Rengers <edreng@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Edward Rengers

391 John Joy Rd

391 John Joy Rd

Woodstock, NY 12498

From: Thomas Pakurar <pak00@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 8:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Thomas Pakurar

13912 Bayport Landing Road

Midlothian, VA 23112

From: Kinsey Service <kintrublu@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kinsey Service

861 Vereda del Ciervo

861 Vereda del Ciervo

Goleta, CA 93117

From: Kate Cloud <kcloud@rcn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kate Cloud

42 Walnut St.

Walnut St.

Somerville, MA 02143

From: Christian Heinold <cheinold@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Christian Heinold

547 24th St Apt 21

#22

Oakland, CA 94612

From: Mark Gallegos <wstcstltn@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mark Gallegos

3211 Gleason Ave

3211 Gleason Ave

Los Angeles, CA 90063

From: Lessye DeMoss <lessye@isp.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lessye DeMoss

316 Caplewood Dr

Apt 6

Tuscaloosa, AL 35401

From: John Pritchard <dennison5930@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Pritchard

183 B Stonebridge Rd

Woodstock

Woodstock, CT 06281

From: Beverly Barry <beverlybarry@att.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Beverly Barry

2710 Avalon St

na

New Orleans, LA 70121

From: Evelyn Grandinetti <evelyng15@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Evelyn Grandinetti

1027 Kenbridge Court

Sunnyvale, CA 94087-61

From: Toddy Perryman <tperryman@bitterroot.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Toddy Perryman

1525 Silver Sage Ln.

1525 Silver Sage Lane

Corvallis, MT 59828

From: donald wallace <donandjacky.wallace@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

donald wallace

470 West Highland Drive

Camarillo, CA 93010

From: Pandora Edmonston <pandora@yosemite.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Pandora Edmonston

4279 Grist rd.

Mariposa, CA 95338

From: Dorri Raskin <bunnyraskin@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dorri Raskin

18350 Los Alimos St

18350 Los Alimos st,Northridge,CA 91326

Northridge, CA 91326

From: Alan Wojtalik <alan_wojtalik@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Alan Wojtalik

3723 Green Oak Court

Baltimore, MD 21234

From: Daniel Kozminski <DanKoz29@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Daniel Kozminski

32625 Stony Brook Lane

Solon, OH 44139

From: Cheryl Schillingowski <clschill@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Schillingowski

Manitowoc, WI 54220

From: David Houseman <davidhouseman199@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Houseman

211 East South Street

211 East South Street

Grand Ledge, MI 48837

From: Gerson Lesser, M.D. <gtl1@nyu.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gerson Lesser, M.D.

5800 Arlington Ave.

Bronx, NY 10471

From: Sally Small <sallyasmall@att.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sally Small

1842 Stratford Rd

Delaware, OH 43015

From: Diane Maly <deedee615@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Diane Maly

101 William Driver Lane

White Bluff, TN 37187

From: Harvey Kaiser <KCSoundHV@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Harvey Kaiser

50 Mohonk Rd

50 Mohonk Rd

High Falls, NY 12440

From: Ganapati Durgadas <Ganesha@nycap.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ganapati Durgadas

261 New Scotland Ave., Apt.2

261 New Scotland Ave., Apt.2

Albany, NY 12208

From: Millard Martin <harpstring@CenturyTel.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Millard Martin

37194 Bay Street NE

Hansville, WA 98340

From: Betts Harley <betts2021@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Betts Harley

2021 Irvine Ave.

ooo

Costa Mesa, CA 92627

From: Vincent DiTizio <theapocalypsewithin@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Vincent DiTizio

233 Ilyssa Way

Staten Island, NY 10312

From: JoAnn Bradley <jbradley@iowatelecom.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

JoAnn Bradley

1103 E Howard

1103 East Howard

Creston, IA 50801

From: Richard Vultaggio <richvultaggio@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Richard Vultaggio

220 Stage Rd

Vestal, NY 13850

From: Elizabeth Kushigian <eakushigian@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Kushigian

31 Cranberry Lane

Dennis Port, MA 02639

From: Kelly Pomeroy <kpterra@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Different solutions needed

I don't pretend to understand the intricacies of the nuclear power debate, but I'll start with the following quote from the Senate energy website:

Currently there is no central repository for spent nuclear fuel, leaving fuel rods to be stored on-site at dozens of commercial nuclear facilities around the country, including areas that are at risk of earthquakes, floods and other natural disasters. Millions of gallons of high-level radioactive waste from the nation's nuclear weapons programs are also being stored at Department of Energy sites around the country. Although DOE has begun to process some of these wastes into more stable forms, DOE recently disclosed that high-level waste storage tanks at Hanford Nuclear Reservation are deteriorating and wastes are continuing to leak from the tanks.

The statement that "fuel rods are being stored at nuclear facilities that are prone to earthquakes, floods and other natural disasters" is particularly telling. If the government was willing to allow nuclear plants to be built in such unsafe locations, how can we trust their judgment on anything relating to nuclear power?

The statement that high-level waste storage tanks at Hanford are continuing to leak radioactive waste underscores the fact that the government is unable or unwilling to learn from its mistakes and take corrective action. Hanford has been leaking radioactive material into the surrounding environment, including the Columbia River, for decades! With this kind of history and continuing reality, how can we trust that this legislation "will provide long-term protection of public health and safety" - protection that must remain effective for thousands of years??

Any solutions will require unflinching government vigilance, basically forever, yet our history of regulation of chemicals (thousands of which have been approved for use by the public with no testing whatsoever), energy production (lack of oversight of oil drilling operations, safety of mining enterprises,

etc.), our food supply (where inspections are typically preannounced, totally inadequate and usually don't require significant change even after many repeated warnings), and so on. Now we face the specter of certain radioactive materials being added to municipal waste streams or being recycled into consumer products!

Agencies that are supposed to protect the public, instead look after the interests of the entities they oversee - which often write the legislation and regulations that are supposed to govern them.

The taxpayers end up paying through the nose to subsidize these companies in many ways, and then pay some more for dealing with their waste, accidents, pollution, mistakes. If we were to eventually retire all nuclear plants and put that money into alternate energy and family planning instead, we would be far better off.

Since that isn't the subject of this hearing, however, I can only say that, despite my lack of technical expertise in this area, I put greatest trust in the judgment and testimony ("Principles for Safeguarding Nuclear Waste at Reactors") of groups like the Nuclear Information and Research Service, Union of Concerned Scientists, Friends of the Earth, et al.

Sincerely,

Kelly Pomeroy

59-148 Olomana Rd.

59-148 Olomana Rd., Kamuela HI 96743

Kamuela, HI 96743

From: Linda Lillow <llillow@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Linda Lillow

5117 La Subida St. NW

5117 La Subida St. NW

Albuquerque, NM 87105

From: Kent Minault <getkent@roadrunner.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kent Minault

13214 Magnolia Blvd.

Sherman Oaks, CA 91423

From: Lisa Lewis <Lewielocks@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

In fact close all nuclear plants since they are unsafe for everyone and we don't actually need them.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lisa Lewis

Berkeley, CA 94710

From: John Kesich <kesich@npacc.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Comparing the discussion draft to the statement of principles at <http://www.nirs.org/radwaste/policy/hossprinciples3232010.pdf>, it is clear that NIRS puts the public interest first while Congress is shamefully looking out for industry.

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John Kesich

628 Bailey Creek Rd

Millerton, PA 16936

From: Stanley Becker <stanleyxbecker@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Stanley Becker

370 west Broadway

Apt 3C

Long Beach, NY 11561

From: Stephen and Robin Newberg <crashnewberg@netscape.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Stephen and Robin Newberg

146 Granville Rd

North Granby, CT 06060

From: Joan Zawaski <jzawaski@alnela.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joan Zawaski

2883 MacArthur Blvd.

Oakland, CA 94602

From: SUE DEAN <DEANKS@JUNO.COM>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

SUE DEAN

33945 N. 66TH WAY

33945 N. 66th Way

SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85266

From: Gerald Oefelein <g.oefelein@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gerald Oefelein

2754 Wilshire Ave. SW

Roanoke, VA 24015

From: kit lofroos <kltkwmn@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

kit lofroos

101A Post

Petaluma, CA 94952

From: Diane Steele <amazonwoman@frontiernet.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Diane Steele

613 Linden St.

Farmington

Farmington, MN 55024

From: Croitiene ganMoryn <adanto@jps.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Croitiene ganMoryn

6211 SE 24th Avenue

6211 SE 24th Avenue

Ocala, FL 34480

From: Liz Dyer <melizabeth.dyer@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Liz Dyer

6604 10th StB1

Alexandria, VA 22307

From: Stephen and Robin Newberg <crashnewberg@netscape.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Stephen and Robin Newberg

146 Granville Rd

North Granby, CT 06060

From: sheila bowers <pointofusesolutions@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority because of the short-sighted policies that allowed nuclear power and its waste to accumulate in the first place. We never should have been saddled with this deadly, expensive, horrible power. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, and the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and energy democracy instead of Big Energy welfare. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources sited in the built environment, not in our wilderness. Time for generous feed in tariffs for rooftop solar and no more poison. America deserves better.

Thank you for your consideration and for an immediate and complete reversal in the awful energy policies this nation has been following for the past century.

sheila bowers

1455 24th street

santa monica, CA 90404

From: Bertha Kriegler <bkriegler@juno.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bertha Kriegler

527 Plymouth ave

527 Plymouth ave

Schenectady, NY 12308

From: Claire Cohen <clasico18@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Claire Cohen

5051 Foothills Dr.

.

Lake Oswego, OR 97034

From: Luther E. Franklin <lufrank@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Luther E. Franklin

19510 SE May Valley RD

19510 SE May Valley Rd

Issaquah, WA 98027

From: Patricia L. Lent <patlent@juno.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Patricia L. Lent

818 Marywood

818 Marywood

Royal Oak, MI 48067

From: Ken Woolard <wooly10@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ken Woolard

2817 Grandview Dr. W. # 7

University PL, WA 98466

From: Helen Logan Hays <hlhays@ccgmail.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Helen Logan Hays

18553 S Ferguson Rd

Oregon City, OR 97045

From: Carolyn Poinelli <gingkolady@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Poinelli

36 Prince St #12

Boston, MA 02113

From: Barbara Hodgkinson <mibar@friendshouse.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Barbara Hodgkinson

684 Benicia Dr., #12

Santa Rosa, CA 95409

From: Sidney Ziring <smartyz@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sidney Ziring

8921 Echo Lane

Boca Raton, FL 33496

From: Nancy Woolley <superfarmor2004@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nancy Woolley

121 Greenbrook Dr.

Stoughton, MA 02072

From: Genevieve Miller <genevieve.jeanette.miller@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Genevieve Miller

3810 Pinewood Terrace

Falls Church, VA 22041

From: Mait Alexander <mba2233@me.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mait Alexander

4175 Shawnee St

Moorpark, CA 93021

From: Patricia Gorton <pattysd@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patricia Gorton

3916 Riviera

#506

San Diego, CA 92109

From: Theresa del Rosario <tdr63@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Theresa del Rosario

881 Otto Avenue

St. Paul, MN 55102

From: Peter Curia <pgeometro@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Peter Curia

2048 N. 68Th Place

2048 N. 68Th Place

Scottsdale, AZ 85257

From: Martha W D Bushnell <marthawdb@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Martha W D Bushnell

502 Ord Drive

502 Ord Drive

Boulder, CO 80303

From: Howard Booth <boothwilson@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Howard Booth

1518 Sandra Drive

Boulder City, NV 89005

From: Robert Handelsman <trtfmnlwr@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Robert Handelsman

2643 Central Park

2643 Central Park

Evanston, IL 60201

From: Colleen McGlone <crmglone@moose-mail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Colleen McGlone

3540 Hartland Dr

New Port Richey, FL 34655

From: Tammy Lettieri <tammylettieri@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tammy Lettieri

2500 Sw 15 St

2500 SW 15 ST

Deerfield, FL 33442

From: Dawn Kosec <dawnkosec@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dawn Kosec

1895 Innwood Drive

Austintown, OH 44515

From: Mary Helen Pederson <sunkawakanwea@goldenwest.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mary Helen Pederson

PO Box 646

Hot Springs, SD 57747

From: Daniel Lutzker <dlutzker@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Daniel Lutzker

24 Lake Celeste Drive

24 Lake Celeste Drive

Garrison, NY 10524

From: Jo Ann Howse <jhowse@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jo Ann Howse

5255 S. 69th East Ave

5255 S. 69th

Tulsa, OK 74145

From: Frank Costanza <fjc623@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Frank Costanza

5160 Washington St.

Hillside, IL 60162

From: Trina Paulus <Compostgal@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

There are times when people and cultures need to face their sins and do their best to do penance. The answer here is not to transport an almost infinitely hazardous material, therefore widening the potential for spreading the risk rather than containing it permanently. The companies which made the waste should clearly expend their profits, subsidized by us to contain it permanently.

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Trina Paulus

Trina Paulus

86 Elm Street

Montclair, NJ 07042

From: andreia shotwell <andreia_shotwell@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

andrea shotwell

3575 Pierce St.

Wheat Ridge, CO 80033

From: Mike Albar <malbar2001@hushmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mike Albar

251-4B Gemini Drive

Hillsborough, NJ 08844

From: Henriette Groot, PhD <hplgroot@kcbx.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Henriette Groot, PhD

1940 Tapidero

NA

Los Osos, CA 93402

From: Janice Rocke <jrocke5@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Janice Rocke

Dome House , Palo Colorado Canyon

Palo Colorado Canyon

Carmel, CA 93923

From: Greg Gentry <gsgentry@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Greg Gentry

2434 Frays Mill Rd

Ruckersville, VA 22968

From: Lawrence Crowley <magic@ecentral.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lawrence Crowley

441 Pheasant Run

Louisville, CO 80027

From: Lawrence Crowley <magic@ecentral.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lawrence Crowley

441 Pheasant Run

Louisville, CO 80027

From: Juanita Dawson-Rhodes <Balance210@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Juanita Dawson-Rhodes

210 Ridgefield Avenue

South Salem, NY 10590

From: Suzanne Crane <sue@suzannecrane.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Suzanne Crane

4225 Earlysville Road

Earlysville, VA 22936

From: Katie Scherfig <katieinmt@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Katie Scherfig

3025 Healy Ave.

Bozeman, MT 59715

From: Sybil Kohl <sybkohl@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sybil Kohl

18103 NE 159th Ave

18103 N.E. 159th Ave.

Brush Prairie, WA 98606

From: Anthony Mitre <mitrius@igc.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Anthony Mitre

10546 Big Mill Court

Apt. 2051

Las Vegas, NV 89135

From: Mary Ann Dougherty <dougherty_86@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Ann Dougherty

19170 Bryant Rd.

19170 Bryant Rd.

Lake Oswego, OR 97034

From: Walter Reece <wreeceyog@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Walter Reece

37 Deer Ridge Road

Wimberley, TX 78676

From: Annette Levey <arlevey@ca.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Annette Levey

1534 S. Shenandoah St. #4

1534 S Shenandoah St Apt 4

Los Angeles, CA 90035

From: Joe Buhowsky <jbuhowsky@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joe Buhowsky

83 Tahoe Court

San Ramon, CA 94582

From: Mary Helen Pederson <sunkawakanwea@goldenwest.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mary Helen Pederson

PO Box 646

Hot Springs, SD 57747

From: NOREEN WHELLER <redwolf91@mindspring.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

NOREEN WHELLER

3 Given Court

125 Avalon Circle

Hauppauge, NY 11788

From: tulay luciano <tulayluciano@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

tulay luciano

808 warrenville road

*Mailing Address is a required field

mansfield center, CT 06250

From: Stephen Rosenblum <Pol1@rosenblums.us>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Change Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable without a defined plan for long term storage of these wastes. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Stephen Rosenblum

212 Santa Rita Ave

Palo Alto, CA 94301

From: Becky Daiss <beckydaiss@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Becky Daiss

1276 N Wayne St

Arlington, VA 22201

From: Louise Calabro <louise.editor@mindspring.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Louise Calabro

Two Bay Club Drive • 1G

Apt. 1-G

Bayside, NY 11360

From: Wendy Oser <woser@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Wendy Oser

1439 Santa Fe Ave

Berkeley, CA 94702

From: Jody Gibson <jodyg8@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jody Gibson

317 E. Wall Ave.

Des Moines, IA 50315

From: Margaia & Jim forcier-Call <margaiafc@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Margaia & Jim forcier-Call

PO Box 43

Jemez Springs, NM 87025

From: nicholas lenchner <airbat@pacbell.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

nicholas lenchner

1324 cashew rd.

santa rosa, CA 95403

From: Fred Lavy <fred-cheryl@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Fred Lavy

524 East Wolfe St

524 East Wolfe St

Harrisonburg, VA 22802

From: Amie King <amie.king@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Amie King

8059 E. Vassar Dr.

Denver, CO 80231

From: Bernie Zelazny <bdz@apcwizard.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bernie Zelazny

PO Box 523

Alpine, TX 79831

From: Gordon Howard <fortescu@optonline.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gordon Howard

Gordon Howard, 53 Cobbleridge Ln

53 Cobbleridge Ln

Manorville, NY 11949

From: Martin Mendelsohn <martin.mendelsohn392@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Martin Mendelsohn

303 Brooke Ave # 203

Norfolk, VA 23510

From: Tom Kaimakides <tkaimakides@optonline.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tom Kaimakides

33 Edinburgh Drive

Peekskill, NY 10566

From: Michiko Wilson <mnw5m@virginia.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michiko Wilson

2025 Bentivar Dr.

Charlottesville, VA 22911

From: Mark Donaldson <azathoth-x@cfl.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mark Donaldson

1548 Croftwood Drive

Melbourne, FL 32935

From: Chris Whalen <porktrailer@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Chris Whalen

11703 Olde English Dr

Unit C

Reston, VA 20190

From: Patrick Clark <patriclark@ca.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Patrick Clark

2431 Duke Place

Costa Mesa, CA 92626

From: Betsie Cole <colem@etsu.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Betsie Cole

16125 Lee Hwy

Bristol, VA 24202

From: Nadine Luru <luru0201@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nadine Lauru

1243 N Kraemer Blvd

Placentia, CA 92870

From: Elaine Hughes <elahu2@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Elaine Hughes

721 Butler Pike

721 Butler Pike, Ambler, PA 19002

Ambler, PA 19002

From: DEBORAH SMITH <deborah993@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

THE WASTE IS A REAL PROBLEM!!! WHEN WOULD IT NOT BE??? NOT IN ANY NEAR CENTURY!!!

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

DEBORAH SMITH

3044 NW 30TH

OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73112

From: e perkins <liz1952@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

e perkins

Box 178

talmage, CA 95481

From: Jeanne Ertle <jertle@sunset.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeanne Ertle

1552 Citrus Avenue

Chico, CA 95926

From: Donald Schwartz <DRSRay54@cs.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Donald Schwartz

2414 Sugarcone Road

2414 Sugarcone Road

Baltimore, MD 21209

From: Sandra Couch <sndrcch@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sandra Couch

2903 Bartlett Court

Unit 201

Naperville, IL 60564

From: Sylvia Richey <srichey7@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Richey

7410 Lake Breeze Dr.

Fort Myers, FL 33907

From: Melissa Bird <nursebird@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Melissa Bird

111 Depot Rd

Harwich, MA 02645

From: Jan McCreary <casabel@gilanet.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jan McCreary

POB 3042

Silver City, NM 88062

From: Andreea Scarlat <adita_tgv@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Andreea Scarlat

Stratford Rd.

Williamsburg, VA 23188

From: Janice Rocke <jrocke5@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Janice Rocke

Dome House , Palo Colorado Canyon

Palo Colorado Canyon

Carmel, CA 93923

From: Louis Nielsen <ripany@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Louis Nielsen

81 Grotto Avenue

n/a

PROVIDENCE, RI 02906

From: Karen Rogers <karen@clarint.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Karen Rogers

28029 133rd Ave SW

Vashon, WA 98070

From: Meryle A. Korn <meryle.korn@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Meryle A. Korn

5256 NE 47th

-

Portland, OR 97218

From: Jeral Henderson <jeralhenderson@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeral Henderson

10834 Steppington Dr./Apt 2407

Dallas, TX 71038

From: dini schut <hschut@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

dini schut

#54-362 Plains Rd E Burlington, On Canada

burlington;, ON L7T0A4

From: James Wilhelmi <jazzyjim57@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Wilhelmi

5552 E Erin Ave

Fresno, CA 93727

From: Susan Nuernberg <nuernber@uwosh.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Susan Nuernberg

147 W 22nd Ave

147 W 22nd Ave

Oshkosh, WI 95409

From: Jeral Henderson <jeralhenderson@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeral Henderson

10834 Steppington Dr./Apt 2407

Dallas, TX 71038

From: James Hosley <bluejkh@softcom.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Hosley

2123 Oregon Street

Berkeley, CA 94705

From: Jeral Henderson <jeralhenderson@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeral Henderson

10834 Steppington Dr./Apt 2407

Dallas, TX 71038

From: William Davis <rees@hvc.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

William Davis

129 Wittenberg Rd

129 Wittenberg Road

Bearsville, NY 12409

From: Gail Sabbadini <gsabbadini@mail.sdsu.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gail Sabbadini

12509 del sol rd

Lakeside, CA 92040

From: David and Betty Knutzen <keepsake@chorus.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

David and Betty Knutzen

5096 Tuggle Lane

Wauunakee, WI 53597

From: PATRICIA MCHUGH <pat.mchugh1999@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

PATRICIA MCHUGH

7008 Amherst Ave

FL 2

Saint Louis, MO 63130

From: susan teitelman <susanteitelman@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

susan teitelman

809 ne brazee

Portland, OR 97212

From: David E. Lilienthal <pegylilienthal@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. It should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. The Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Thank you,

David E. Lilienthal

1796 Main Street

East Dennis, MA 02641

From: Les Ego <rev-les-ego@online.ie>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Les Ego

Les Ego

151 First Avenue

151 First Avenue, NYC 10003

New York, NY 10003

From: Amelia Kroeger <ackroeger@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

These comments are truly important and significant. As a policy maker you must surely recognize why this draft is not acceptable.

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Amelia Kroeger

65 Stubbs Bay Road

Maple Plain, MN 55364

From: Linda Schermer <lschermer@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Linda Schermer

500 Mtn Lilac Dr

Sedona, AZ 86336

From: Wynne Corson <wynnetwo@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Wynne Corson

3355 N Racine Avenue

Chicago, IL 60657

From: Michael Bayouth <baybaysparky@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Bayouth

636 Eastern #101

636 Eastern #101

Wichita, KS 67207

From: Marian Adrian <madrian1@rochester.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marian Adrian

326 caroline ST. apt 5

Albion, NY 14411

From: carolyn modeen <ctmodeen@royaloakslife.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

carolyn modeen

10015 W. Royal Oaks Rd

321

sun City, AZ 85351

From: Vic Burton <cvburton@swbell.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Vic Burton

5837 Grand Ave.

Kansas City, MO 64113

From: Frances Moore <fcmoore2@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Frances Moore

2511 Lynnwood Dr

Unit 435

Bellevue, NE 68123

From: Karma Lekshe Tsomo <tsomo@sandiego.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Karma Lekshe Tsomo

2026 Emerald St.

San Diego, CA 92109

From: Georgia Mattingly <glmattingly@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Georgia Mattingly

412 Verdant Circle

Longmont, CO 80504

From: cristiane pimentel <cpp2006@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

cristiane pimentel

r s elias

recife, ot 52020090

From: Cynthia Enlow <hienlow@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cynthia Enlow

1460 NW Ashley Dr

none

Albany, OR 97321

From: Alexander Dalton <alexander.dalton@live.longwood.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Alexander Dalton

16059 Saint Peters Church Road

Montpelier, VA 23192

From: Edith Frederick <ediesan@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Edith Frederick

121 Winham Street

Salinas, CA 93901

From: Michael Iannone Jr <mickey1379@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Iannone Jr

306 Bluemont Drive

306 Bluemont Drive

West Mifflin, PA 15122

From: Dr. Neil and Evelyn Aronson <n.aronson@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dr. Neil and Evelyn Aronson

9822 N. Karlov

Skokie, IL 60076

From: Mike Smith <mike55smith@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mike Smith

1531 1st Ave

Seattle, WA 98101

From: ken gunther <ecocosm@bellsouth.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

ken gunther

11024 161st St. N

11024 161st St. N

Jupiter, FL 33478

From: Ronda Snider <rondasnider@eml.cc>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ronda Snider

13805 Easy Street Kp N

13805 Easy Street Kp N

Gig Harbor, WA 98329

From: Mary Barker <mfrances52@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mary Barker

2550 E Avenue I Spc 47

Lancaster, CA 93535

Lancaster, CA 93535

From: S Jahangeer <sjahangeer@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

S Jahangeer

Wood Wren Court

Fairfax, VA 22032

From: Greg Sells <gsells@austin.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Greg Sells

3300 Parker Ln.

Apt. 258

Austin, TX 78741

From: Tom Hoffman <gopullman@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tom Hoffman

135 Davis Lane

Pearisburg, VA 24134

From: Brenda Troup <brendat21@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Brenda Troup

21 Meadow Road

21 Meadow Road

Bolton, MA 01740

From: Kelly Garbato <kelly.garbato@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kelly Garbato

147 SE 260th ST

Plattsburg, MO 64477

From: Lenore Greenberg <lenoreg@nyc.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lenore Greenberg

120 Boerum Pl. 1J

Brooklyn, NY 11201

From: Dorothy Decker <namadee1@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dorothy Decker

2922 Grizzly Drive

Ashland, OR 97520

From: James Wilhelmi <jazzyjim57@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Wilhelmi

5552 E Erin Ave

Fresno, CA 93727

From: Robert Janusko <janusko@rcn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Robert Janusko

1329 Eaton Ave.

xxxxx

Bethlehem, PA 18018

From: R. Marti <rjmarti@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 6:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

R. Marti

1800 Midick

Altadena, CA 91001

From: S Meyers <satiny33717@mypacks.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

S Meyers

367 E. 11th St.

Upland, CA 91786

From: Keir Sterling <kbs1934@cs.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Keir Sterling

7104 Wheeler Rd

Richmond, VA 23229

From: Tina Snyder <tonopahtina@frontiernet.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Tina Snyder

3260 Golden Mountain Lane

Tonopah, NV 89049

From: Susan Fasten <smfasten@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Susan Fasten

72 Linden St.

72 Linden St. Wellesley, MA

Wellesley, MA 02482

From: Ronald Warren <ronw@imageiv.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ronald Warren

3041 E Chevy Chase Dr

Glendale, CA 91206

From: Rhoda Gilman <rhodagilman@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rhoda Gilman

513 Superior Street

513 Superior St.

St. Paul, MN 55102

From: anthony messina <surfone@optonline.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Anthony Messina

anthony messina

1 springview court

1 Spring Springview Court

east patchogue, NY 11772

From: Mary Cato <mary.e.cato@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Cato

1807 Pecan Park Drive

Arlington, TX 76012

From: Jody Fritzke <Thefritzkes@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jody Fritzke

1465 267th. Ave. NE

1465 267th. Avve. Ne

Isanti, MN 55040

From: Jody Fritzke <Thefritzkes@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jody Fritzke

1465 267th. Ave. NE

1465 267th. Avve. Ne

Isanti, MN 55040

From: James Mulcare <xsecretsx@cableone.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

James Mulcare

1110 Benjamin St

Clarkston, WA 99403

From: Donna Caire <dinojoel@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Donna Caire

23198 Brook Forest Road

23198 Brook Forest Road

Abita Springs, LA 70420

From: Lee Baker <lbaker2@triad.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lee Baker

2506 Sylvan Road

2506 Sylvan Road

Greensboro, NC 27403

From: Eric Hamburg <ehamburg@centurytel.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over. We need a safer solution.

Sincerely,

Eric Hamburg

1166 4th Street

Baraboo, WI 53913

From: Susan Clark <georgnbay@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Susan Clark

13400RIVERSIDE DRIVE

13400 riverside drive

Sherman Oaks, CA 91423

From: jeff asch <jeffjam1@lycos.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

jeff asch

2254 nw glisan

portland, OR 97210

From: ROXANNE LOGET <moonroxx@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

ROXANNE LOGET

1650 FOREST AV

APT. 69

CHICO, CA 95076

From: Donna Nina <donnina18@optimum.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Donna Nina

139 W Englewood Ave Apt 6B

Apt 6B

Teaneck, NJ 07666

From: Esther B. Wolf <benlobo@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Esther B. Wolf

5433 Leary Ave. N .W.

4009 30 Ave. W.

Seattle, WA 98107

From: Melissa Atkinson <melissa@ballroomdancers.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Melissa Atkinson

10647 Ashby Ave

Los Angeles, CA 90064

From: Joan Crowe <horsefeathers7@windstream.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It is of greatest importance. The Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems:

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the proposal under discussion would delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should be asked to accept such an outcome.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the immediate interests of the nuclear power industry, The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joan Crowe

Joan Crowe

130 Morgan Street

Versailles, KY 40383

From: Hunter Wallof <huntergatherer8@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Hunter Wallof

12340 SFD

A

Pt. reyes sta., CA 94956

From: Fred Lavy <fred-cheryl@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Fred Lavy

524 East Wolfe St

Harrisonburg, VA 22802

From: Julie Ling-Iino <jlino7@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Julie Ling-Ino

551 36th Avenue

551 36th Avenue

San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Margery Coffey <margerycoffey@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Margery Coffey

P.O. Box 279

none

Rosalie, NE 68055

From: Gloria Garfunkel <docglo@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gloria Garfunkel

95 Hibbert Street

Arlington, MA 02476

From: Laura Goodman <laurawnderer@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Laura Goodman

10211-C Willow Mist Court

Oakton, VA 22124

From: Ashwin Purohit <apurohit8@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ashwin Purohit

582 Western Ave

Gloucester, MA 01930

From: Kenneth Hoppe <kenneth.hoppe@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kenneth Hoppe

1620 Juniper Ridge Loop

Cedar Park, TX 78613

From: Sharon Gillespie <pretend@austin.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sharon Gillespie

1103 Enfield

Austin, TX 78703

From: Gerard Swainson <gswainson@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gerard Swainson

9343 Athens Rd

Address Line 2

Fairfax, VA 22032

From: John Bernard <johndbernard@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety, and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails, and waterways, even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome; yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection, and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry, which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John Bernard

56 Mildred St.

South Portland, ME 04106

From: byron mathis <bmathis42@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

byron mathis

11721 Parliament St

Apt 115

San Antonio, TX 78213

From: Connie Dilts <randcdilts@speakeasy.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Connie Dilts

8118 SW Tenth Ave

8118 SW Tenth Ave

Portland, OR 97219

From: Michael Mannion <Mannionabc@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michael Mannion

3 West 87th Street

3 west 87th street

New York, NY 10024

From: Shelley Coss <viola.opera@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Shelley Coss

923 S Taylor St

Arlington, VA 22204

From: Moss, LaMarr (SCC)

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Test

Please respond if you receive this message.

New rules have been set for you to receive these messagesFrom: Alexis Abrams <a-alexis@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Alexis Abrams

1220 Montecito Drive

Los Angeles, CA 90031

From: Carmen Bonilla-Jones <consulraaj@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carmen Bonilla-Jones

545 Yale Road

545 Yale Road

Venice, FL 34293

From: Audrey Clement <aclement65@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Audrey Clement

5709 10th Road North #A

#A

Arlington, VA 22205

From: Debbie Richards <baboo4u@clear.net.nz>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Debbie Richards

5675 N. Fresno St

Riccarton

Fresno, CA 93710

From: Arlene Schutz <aschutz@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Arlene Schutz

145 East 16th St

45 East 16th St

New York, NY 10003

From: William Blackman III <rotary_elite@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

William Blackman III

107 Orchid Court

Round O, SC 29474

From: Diane Carmody <carmody183@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Diane Carmody

49 Hunt Dr

Florida, NY 10921

From: Andrew Liefer <aliefer@wiley.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Andrew Liefer

224 Sullivan st.

#F22

New York, NY 10012

From: Orman Gaspar <Ormang@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Orman Gaspar

PO box 5125

555 Hot Springs Rd.

Santa Barbara, CA 93108

From: Ruth Wilburn <jabar4@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ruth Wilburn

Oak Tree Blvd

Christiansburg, VA 24073

From: Leslie Bradshaw <neilandleslie@mac.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

I want to be very clear: I don't want "interim" storage of high-level radio active waste. I don't want our roads and rails to be burdened or jeopardized by transporting thousands of casks of lethal nuclear waste to a "temporary" and unsuitable location just because it makes the nuclear industry's life easier. Americans don't want this. Please do the will of the people.

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Leslie Bradshaw

P.O. Box 7217

PO Box 7217

Ketchum, ID 83340

From: Lynette Strangstad <strangstad@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lynette Strangstad

327 Doty St.

327 Doty St.

Mineral Point, WI 53565

From: Bob Brister <bob@uec-utah.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bob Brister

1102 S 800 E #A

Salt Lake City, UT 84105

From: marilyn field <mfield1@san.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

marilyn field

1101 1st Street

Apt. 208

Coronado, CA 92118

From: Lynne Torres <lyana4444@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lynne Torres

3581 Horita

3581 Horita

Koloa, HI 96756

From: Larry Hovekamp <ellisplatt@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Larry Hovekamp

3433 Newburg Rd. #5

#5

Louisville, KY 40218

From: Deborah Fitzgerald <dfitz.1954@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Deborah Fitzgerald

14 Milltown Road

14 Milltown Road

Bridgewater, NJ 08807

From: Steven Kranowski <skranowski@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Steven Kranowski

816 Montgomery St.

Blacksburg, VA 24060

From: harvey herrick <scottherrick@mac.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

harvey herrick

3864 la jolla village dr.

3864 La Jolla Village Dr

la jolla, CA 92037

From: Tim Ryther` <tdryther@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Tim Ryther`

114 Spring Creek

114 Spring Creek St.

Waco, TX 76705

From: Darlene Friese <dfsdarlene@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Darlene Friese

ON181 Hathaway

West Chicago, IL 60185

From: Ruth Briggs <ruthbriggs1@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ruth Briggs

1885 Pinetree

1885 Pinetree

Trenton, MI 48183

From: Clifford Stepina <flyingstepinas@att.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Clifford Stepina

2425 Chevy Chase

2425 Chevy Chase

Joliet, IL 60435

From: Nancy Danielsen <nancyd@thelibrary.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nancy Danielsen

807 E NORMAL ST

807 E NORMAL ST

SPRINGFIELD, MO 65807

From: Debra Gakeler <gakeler@everestkc.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Debra Gakeler

11503 Rosehill Rd

Overland Park, KS 66210

From: A Carner <asherea2@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

A Carner

432 Manor Road

Newport News, VA 23608

From: Lopamudra Mohanty <Lopamudra_giri@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lopamudra Mohanty

1542 River Birch Dr

St.Peters, MO 63376

From: Peggy White <whitpj431@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Peggy White

431 Booth Ave

431 Booth Aven

Owensboro, KY 42301

From: Harold T. Hodes <hth3@cornell.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Harold T. Hodes

102 Homestead Terrace

Ithaca, NY 14850

From: James Matrix <x3296@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Matrix

1028 South Walter Reed Drive

Arlington, VA 22204

From: Lisa Fues <ljfues@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lisa Fues

9a W Caton Ave

Alexandria, VA 22301

From: Billy Kemp <bkemp@healthpointchc.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Billy Kemp

P. O. Box 112396

Tacoma, WA 98411

From: Judith Pearson <juda33@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Judith Pearson

PO Box 647

905 Highland

Estancia, NM 87016

From: Peggy Dirsra <onegist@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

You need to keep our citizens and our land and roads SAFE!!!

Sincerely,

Peggy Dirsra

1006 Shorwinds Drive

Fort Pierce, FL 34949

From: Clara Eder <ceder26@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Clara Eder

1616 Crowell Rd

Vienna, VA 22182

From: Blake Bentley <Blake3B@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Blake Bentley

2629 Laburnum Ave

Roanoke, VA 24015

From: Carl Barnwell <cbarnw@centurytel.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Carl Barnwell

654 West Blocker

Colcord, OK 74338

From: Rosemarie Sawdon <sawdon@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rosemarie Sawdon

1201 Harvest Ridge Lane

Blacksburg, VA 24060

From: June Adler <juneadler@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

June Adler

509 N. 7th St.

509 N. 7th St.

Alpine, TX 79830

From: Candy LeBlanc <telvari9@care2.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Candy LeBlanc

1525 Cold Springs Rd

SPC 52

Placerville, CA 95667

From: Heather Schlaff <hschlaff@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Heather Schlaff

333 Stonebridge Drive

VE

Chico, CA 95973

From: Mary Parker <mailmare@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Parker

2251 Pimmit Drive

#1011

Falls Church, VA 22043

From: Evelyn Haas <oldleft@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Evelyn Haas

7832 Lister st.

Phila., PA 19152

From: James Kunz <jimkunz44@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Kunz

1218 Coral Reef Ct.

New Bern, NC 28560

From: Frieda Stahl <fstahl@calstatela.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Frieda Stahl

842 E. Villa St.

apt.303

Pasadena, CA 91101

From: Bob Greenbaum <bombhumbug@att.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bob Greenbaum

4105 Stilmore Rd.

4105 Stilmore Rd

Cleveland, OH 44121

From: Suzanne Schwartz <eototos@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Suzanne Schwartz

9 Eototo Rd.

El Prado, NM 87529

From: Faith Vis <faithvis@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over. TRUCKS CAN HAVE ACCIDENTS, THINK ABOUT THAT!

Sincerely,

Faith Vis

1621 Highlands Road

1621 Highlands Road, New Milford, PA

New Milford, PA 18834

From: Noah and Natasha Brenner <2brenners@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Noah and Natasha Brenner

229 Chrystie St.

229 Chrystie Street Apt. 715

New York, NY 10002

From: Nick Berezansky <nick@acereprographic.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nick Berezansky

123 Washington Pl.

Ridgewood, NJ 07450

From: Kathy Williams <luvmoonpie@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

I live in the state of South Carolina. I can assure you that the citizens of this state do NOT wish to be the dumping ground of the country. I and many others oppose what is planned at the SRS near Aiken, SC.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kathy Williams

1066 Deer Crossing Road

Orangeburg, SC 29118

From: Gloria Morrison <gloriaje@classicnet.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gloria Morrison

1709 W. Jackson Blv.

Pecos, TX 79772

From: joan blake <teacher411@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

joan blake

Toms River, NJ 08753

From: Eric Boyce <Ericsb274@netzero.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Eric Boyce

P.O. Box 274

P.O. Box 274

Hatboro, PA 19040

From: Penny Derleth <penny.derleth@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Penny Derleth

PO Box 421

110 East A Street

Deer Park, WA 99006

From: Janet Sutton <manyhahama@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Janet Sutton

4329 SE Secretariat Dr.

4329 SE Secretariat Dr.

Lees Summit, MO 64082

From: Maria Hegerstrom <mariahegerstrom@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Maria Hegerstrom

11494 Lakeview Drive

Lakeview Drive

Coral Springs, FL 33076

From: Ingrid Martin <cm.ingrid@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ingrid Martin

Mineral, VA 23117

From: Arthur Leibowitz <arthurleibowitz@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

In addition to making the storage and movement of nuclear waste safer we MUST change our philosophy and CHARGE the nuclear industry for the cost of waste disposal. Taxpayers can not afford this expense and it should be paid by the creators of nuclear waste.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Arthur Leibowitz

322 Lake Shore Road

Putnam Valley, NY 10579

From: E.S. SCHLOSS <ESS.007@RCN.COM>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

E.S. SCHLOSS

155 E. 93RD ST., #4A

155 E. 93RD ST., #4A

NY, NY 10128

From: Glenn Lanum <glenn@lanum.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

I am so glad you are focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It is a high priority for all of us. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Glenn Lanum

247 Stanford Avenue

247 Stanford Avenue

Menlo Park, CA 94025

From: Jennifer Falbo-Negron <jafalbo@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Falbo-Negron

1924 Sun Drop Court

Bartlett, IL 60103

From: Christopher Mason <cmason1@cinci.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Christopher Mason

8592 Eagles Walk Lane

8592

Cincinnati, OH 45255

From: James Roberts <jimrobj@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Roberts

215 S Ellis St

Palouse, WA 99161

From: Clarence Thomson <coach@fairpoint.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Clarence Thomson

35439 Mission Belleview

35439 Mission Belleview

Louisburg, KS 66053

From: MeiLi McCann-Sayles <alanjunk@suddenlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

MeiLi McCann-Sayles

1696 Ocean Drive

McKinleyville, CA 95519

From: cynthia molinero <turtlezavirgo@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

cynthia molinero

po box 470322

po box 440274

aurora, CO 80047

From: Cathy Lambeth <dropzone5@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cathy Lambeth

2635 W. Alta

Springfield, MO 65810

From: Sayantan Biswas <rhaco67@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sayantana Biswas

Philadelphia, PA 19144

From: Jerry and Lois Wharton/Putzier <jwhar76024@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jerry and Lois Wharton/Putzier

5033 E. 23rd St.

na

Tucson, AZ 85711

From: Kyle Marksteiner <kmarksteiner@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Feedback

Attachments: executivesummary_CarlsbadNuclearTaskForce.docx;
question1_Heaton_Carlsbadnucleartaskforce.docx; question2_Heaton_Carlsbadnucleartaskforce.docx;
question3_Heaton_Carlsbadnucleartaskforce.docx; question4_Heaton_Carlsbadnucleartaskforce.docx;
question5_Heaton_Carlsbadnucleartaskforce.docx; question6_Heaton_Carlsbadnucleartaskforce.docx;
question7_Heaton_Carlsbadnucleartaskforce.docx; question8_Heaton_Carlsbadnucleartaskforce.docx

Good afternoon: I'm submitting these on behalf of John Heaton, chair of the Carlsbad Mayor's Nuclear Task Force, and on behalf of the task force as an advisory body. Please let me know if anything is in error, but please contact Mr. Heaton directly if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Kyle Marksteiner

From: T MILLER <IPOSHARES@GMAIL.COM>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

T MILLER

9001 SW 77 AV

9001 SW 77 Av

Miami, FL 33156

From: carol dodson <cdodson7@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Why can Germany come up with a long-term solution to their energy issues, minus nuclear sources, and we have not? And how will we compete globally when other countries leap ahead of us in the use of clean energy while we are still dependent on nuclear and fossil fuel sources?

Thank you for your consideration.

carol dodson

108 Laurel Bay Lane

Columbia, SC 29045

From: sara Roderer <sroderer@mbc.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

sara Roderer

10616 Harborough rd

10616 Harborough Road

Richmond, VA 23238

From: choky alvarez <carlosalva8840@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

choky alvarez

7100 rue bordeaux

miami, FL 33141

From: Gretel Munroe <gsmunroe@me.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration. Without a good solution to this problem whether done in stages or not, future generations will suffer.

Gretel Munroe

9 Leyden Ave.

Medford, MA 02155

From: Caryn Cowin <caryn_cowin@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Caryn Cowin

317 Monterey Road

Apt. 15

South Pasadena, CA 91030

From: Nancy Ellingham <nancyee@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nancy Ellingham

14601 SE 55th St.

Bellevue, WA 98006

From: Lisa Stone <lestone@aya.yale.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lisa Stone

8902 Birdwood Ct

Street Address 2

Houston, TX 77096

From: Ellen E Barfield <ellene4pj@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ellen E Barfield

814 Powers St

Baltimore, MD 21211

From: Gina Santonas <gsantonas@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gina Santonas

80 Jewel St

80 Jewel St

Brooklyn, NY 11222

From: Natalie Houghton <tallyho4617@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem: this should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, de-linking an interim site from progress on a permanent solution (found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative) would only delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment, and make it MORE likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future, rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Natalie Houghton

Woods Trl

Prescott, AZ 86305

From: William Rose <wmlrose@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

William Rose

2109 Rosewood Ave

Richmond, VA 23220

From: Kathryn Roberg <kroberg@fspa.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kathryn Roberg

1027 Cameron Ave.

LaCrosse, WI 54601

From: Harry Hochheiser <hshoch@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Harry Hochheiser

5742 Woodmont St

Pittsburgh, PA 15217

From: Jason Davis <diamondchampion@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jason Davis

736 N. Sanchez St.

Montebello, CA 90640

From: Paige Murphy-Young <murphyyoung@mindspring.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Paige Murphy-Young

9620 S. Dateland Dr.

Tempe, AZ 85284

From: Carmen Elisa Bonilla-Jones <consulraaj@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

You need to shut down the nuclear plants and go with solar and wind!

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Carmen Elisa Bonilla-Jones

545 Yale Road

Venice, FL 34293

From: Thomas Nelson <twnelson@erols.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Thomas Nelson

105 Drexel Ave.

none

Lansdowne, PA 19050

From: Roger Longley <rdlongley@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

As a former senior nuclear engineer with General Dynamics who switched fields to biology, and now an emeritus member of the Society for Neuroscience with a Ph.D. in biology, I am qualified to comment on the handling of radioactive waste.

Transporting nuclear waste, especially high level nuclear waste, to another site is not a solution to the problem. It is likely to make containment more difficult as the amount of material increases in a new location. Continuing storage on site where the radioactivity was generated is the most economical, the safest, and most ecologically desirable solution.

The US should look to Germany and be warned of the problems and expense to come in decommissioning nuclear reactors, which must eventually happen. In hindsight, nuclear power is an economic and ecological disaster, which will remain a problem for generations to come. The problem of dealing with nuclear waste can not be solved by simply moving it from one temporary storage site to another.

Roger Longley

Friday Harbor, WA 98250

From: Chris MacKrell <c.mackrell@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Chris MacKrell

4835 E Anaheim St # 211

Long Beach, CA 90804

From: Barry Schwartz <barryschwartz1@mac.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Barry Schwartz

5510 W. 78th Street

Los Angeles, CA 90045

From: John Fernandez <killgoretrot@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Fernandez

41 Starwood Dr.

41 Starwood Dr.

Hampstead, NH 03841

From: Joseph Buhowsky <jbuhowsky@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joseph Buhowsky

83 Tahoe Court

San Ramon, CA 94582

From: Richard Bachman <rjsbach@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Richard Bachman

3302 King George Lane

Friendswood, TX 77546

From: Arabelle Hurst <granhurst@tharin.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Arabelle Hurst

451 Cabrillo St.

451 Cabrillo St

Costa Mesa, CA 92627

From: Aaeron Robb <antigonemydear@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aaeron Robb

803 East 34th Street

Baltimore, MD 21218

From: Diane H. Fabian <dhfabian@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Diane H. Fabian

217 S Water St E #206

217 S Water St E #206

Fort Atkinson, WI 53538

From: Ellen Kent <ellenk323@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ellen Kent

107 Hill Valley Drive

Winchest, VA 22602

From: peter smith <petertumpy@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

peter smith

14021 232 ave se

14021 232 ave se

issaquah, WA 98027

From: Grace Adams <graceadams830@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Since US Navy has the world's best safety record on nuclear power, I suspect that dumping the problem in US Navy's lap--just giving them carte blanche to do whatever they believe is best may be the best solution. They are really competent to handle nuclear power--they have been doing so in cramped quarters for decades. They are military and thus well able to handle terrorists.

Sincerely,

Grace Adams

406 Valley St 3

none

Willimantic, CT 06226

From: Mary Bunting <mcb5883@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mary Bunting

6506 Darnall Rd

6506 Darnall Rd

Baltimore, MD 21204

From: Frieda Stahl <fstahl@calstatela.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Frieda Stahl

842 E. Villa St.

apt.303

Pasadena, CA 91101

From: Esther Leonard <dawnstar1937@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Esther Leonard

154 Cedar Street

Huntington, WV 25705

From: James Auerbach <jimheals@juno.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Auerbach

673 Scenic Heights Drive SE

E

Salem, OR 97306

From: Chena Mesling <c_1mesling@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Chena Mesling

2330 SE Taylor St

Portland, OR 97214

From: Rhonda Holt <tereholt@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rhonda Holt

3300 Hemlock Ln 605

Miamisburg, OH 45424

From: john f martinez <inmart5@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

john f martinez

323 n. soto st.

323 n. soto st. #70

los angeles, CA 90033

From: Rufus Morison, PhD <rmorison@btes.tv>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Rufus Morison, PhD

612 Florida Ave

Bristol, TN 37620

From: Debra Saude <deanndeb@centurytel.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Debra Saude

1050 Pleasant Valley Rd

1050 Pleasant Valley Rd

Sweet Home, OR 97386

From: lois kyes <lkyes111@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

lois kyes

3150 windsong dr

2307

tallahassee, FL 32303

From: Jose Ricardo Bondoc <Esqbondoc@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jose Ricardo Bondoc

410 Winston Dr., Apt. #104

San Francisco, CA 94132

From: ralph litwin <ralphlit@juno.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

ralph litwin

72 Dean Rd.

72 dean rd

Mendham, NJ 07945

From: Richard Hover <rchover@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Face the facts: either we haul radioactive waste around the country, by train or truck, or we bury it where it is. What kind of a lunatic would haul cancer-causing, poisonous chemicals around the country? An accident anywhere would render the area uninhabitable forever! Hey, guys! It might be YOUR district!

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Richard Hover

2920 Alt 19

#117

Dunedin, FL 34698

From: Nancy Seats <nseats@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

We desperately need a PERMANENT solution to the nuclear waste problem. The American people elected you to make tough decisions to protect us all and we expect a PERMANENT solution!

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nancy Seats

5439 Kenrick Parke Dr.

410 S Geyer Rd

St. Louis, MO 63119

From: Ted Clausen <tjclausen@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ted Clausen

2120 N Pacific Ave #65

Santa Cruz, CA 95060

From: Larry Bulling <larry.bulling@oregonstate.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Larry Bulling

2321 NW Mulkey Ave.

n/a

Corvallis, OR 97330

From: Molly Hauck <mollyhauck@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Molly Hauck

4004 Dresden St.

Kensington, MD 20895

From: Satya Vayu <satyavayu@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Satya Vayu

4418 SE Harrison

Portland, OR 97215

From: Donna Raicevic <dkraicevic@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Donna Raicevic

3120 Jerves St.

#E6

Lihue, HI 96766

From: Karen Larsen <jdbfan@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Karen Larsen

6857 S. Bannock St.

6857 S. Bannock St.

Littleton, CO 80120

From: Doris Zumpe <dzumpe@emory.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Doris Zumpe

2495 Hunting Valley Drive

Decatur, GA 30033

From: Laura Lopez <l2j3_God@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Laura Lopez

101 Lake Gloria Drive

West Palm Beach, FL 33411

From: B Foppiano <thewiz@funlivemusic.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

B Foppiano

604 A Castillo Rd

San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

From: Mary Fineran <yarmaf0@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Fineran

110 W. Wissahickon Ave;

Street Address 2

Flourtown, PA 19031

From: Veloma Scott <scott.mardie@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Veloma Scott

Dana Point,, CA 92629

From: Ann Rennacker <annxpress@live.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ann Rennacker

31200 Sherwood Rd

Ft Bragg, CA 95437

From: N Houghton <tallyho4617@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would NOT fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways, even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution, found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative, would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment, making it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

Please focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future, rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

N Houghton

Woods Trl

Prescott, AZ 86305

From: Rick Bernard <rickebernard@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rick Bernard

230 Oak Springs Drive

San Anselmo, CA 94960

From: Doris Zumpe <dzumpe@learnlink.emory.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Doris Zumpe

2495 Hunting Valley Drive

Decatur, GA 30033

From: Randall Hartman <erthguy2@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Randall Hartman

2345 vermont

2345 vista hermosa

Torrance, CA 92673

From: Mark S <tedebearmark@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mark S

2528 38th Av. S.

2528 38TH AV. S.

Minneapolis, MN 55406

From: Linda Brebner <lbbreb@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Linda Brebner

254 Highland Parkway

254 Highland Parkway

Rochester, NY 14620

From: Marcia Halligan <cocoon@mwt.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be a top priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program seems indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not solve any problems at all, and simply can not be accepted. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will need to be moved at some point, it should first only travel the short distance from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and increase the likelihood that a

temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that result.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem, of course, would be to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. However, for the existing waste, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution will be imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marcia Halligan

S 4001 River Road

Viroqua, WI 54665

From: Debra Kness <debkness@centurylink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Debra Kness

Columbia, MO 65202

From: Kenyon Karl <kenyon_karl@mail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kenyon Karl

17 Ephraim Page Rd

Wentworth, NH 03282

From: Steven G. Kellman <kellman1@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Steven G. Kellman

302 Fawn Drive

302 Fawn Drive

San Antonio, TX 78231

From: Toni Garmon <tarmon3@windstream.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Toni Garmon

103 Honeysucke Trl.

Dawsonville, GA 30534

From: Sidney Goldstein <sg@mrbasketball.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sidney Goldstein

201 W Evergreen Ave, #503

#503

philadelphia, PA 19118

From: Steve Dickman <dickman@binghamton.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Consolidated Interim Storage is a Bad Idea

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. The Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation, however, would only exacerbate the problems of our country's high-level radioactive waste program.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. Although the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation.

A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways-- even without an accident.

Please focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program.

The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you.

Steve Dickman

1404 Livingston Place

Vestal, NY 13850

From: MARTIN ANSELL <flash999@flash.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

MARTIN ANSELL

8715 WEST KNOLL DRIVE

8715 WEST KNOLL DRIVE

WEST HOLLYWOOD, CA 90069

From: Laurel Rohrer <laurel.rohrer@urs.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Laurel Rohrer

12420 Milestone Center Drive

Germantown, MD 20876

From: Gilda Fusilier <gfusilier@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gilda Fusilier

955 43rd Avenue

112

Sacramento, CA 95831

From: Aaron Ucko <amu@alum.mit.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aaron Ucko

2817 Woodley Road, NW

Washington, DC 20008

From: A Bonvouloir <ra3ajw@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

A Bonvouloir

POB 70185

Sunnyvale, CA 94086

From: Laurie Headrick <lash37@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Laurie Headrick

2837 Penasco

San Clemente, CA 92673

From: Christa Kurvits <xpproducts@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Christa Kurvits

605 mountain ave. sw

Basement Suite 01

Roanoke, VA 24016

From: William Hulme <wrh147@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

William Hulme

15606 parklane

plymouth, MI 48170

From: Kathleen McNally (Mrs. John M. McNally) <krasmcn@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kathleen McNally (Mrs. John M. McNally)

7213 Via Amparo

7213 Via Amparo

San Jose, CA 95135

From: zion woods <zionwoods@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

zion woods

1815 mission cliff drive

1815 mission cliff drive

san diego, CA 92116

From: Sheri Langham <sheri.langham@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sheri Langham

3000 Spout Run Parkway

Arlington, VA 22201

From: Casey Heisler <caseyfheisler@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Casey Heisler

7135 W Villa Chula

Glendale, AZ 85310

From: Kathleen Williams <jkewilliams@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kathleen Williams

136 Sloop St

Address Line 2

Jamestown, RI 02835

From: Genie Borrelli <genie_96@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Genie Borrelli

PO Box 51

Assaria, KS 67416

From: Betty G. Ware <bettybware@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Betty G. Ware

2 Paxton Road

Richmond, VA 23226

From: Marc Santora <santoram@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Marc Santora

506 Philadelphia Ave

#302

Takoma Park, MD 20912

From: Roselene Haines <Rhaines15@tampabay.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Roselene Haines

2559 Dale Ann Dr

Haines City, FL 33844

From: Simon Teolis <Celticmanst@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Simon Teolis

5 South Stargazer

Santa Fe, NM 87506

From: Johann Mitchell <lostarts4@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

You really needed to solve this problem no later than 20 years ago! This is just finding a way to put a real solution off for a longer time, and is unworkable and unacceptable! You never should have gone into this without a solution already planned!

Thank you for your consideration.

Johann Mitchell

12800 Harbor Drive #409

Woodbridge, VA 22192

From: Richard Gingras <dgingras77@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Richard Gingras

8121 Airport Rd

Quinton, VA 23141

From: Ernest Paviour <pop95@rochester.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ernest Paviour

7998 Lookout knob

7998 Lookout knob

Victor, NY 14564

From: Anita Bixenstine <anitabix@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Anita Bixenstine

407 Wilson Ave.

Kent, OH 44240

From: Phil Hanson <phanson@spiretech.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be among our top priorities. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate existing problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while increasing exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome, yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry -- the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. For the waste that exists now, hardened on-site storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Phil Hanson

2215 S.E. Miller Street #22

2215 S.E. Miller Street #22

Portland, OR 97202

From: Phil Hanson <phanson@spiretech.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be among our top priorities. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate existing problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while increasing exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome, yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry -- the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. For the waste that exists now, hardened on-site storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Phil Hanson

2215 S.E. Miller Street #22

2215 S.E. Miller Street #22

Portland, OR 97202

From: Paul Frizane <paulfrizane@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Paul Frizane

3020 East Main Street

F50

Mesa, AZ 85213

From: Esther Shorr <spirit_togo@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Esther Shorr

17 Briarwood Road

Palmyra, VA 22963

From: Vivian Valtri Burgess <vivian@greenmountainhosting.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Vivian Valtri Burgess

4184 VT Route 100

Granville, VT 05747

From: Douglas McNeill <doug.mcneill@wap.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Douglas McNeill

33 Ridge Rd, Unit T

unit T

Greenbelt, MD 20770

From: Joan Breit <joan.breit@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joan Breit

204 W 23rd

North Newton, KS 67117

From: Bruce Dobson <hosho@whidbey.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bruce Dobson

5026 Deer Trail Lane

Langley, WA 98260

From: David Dumas <thedumas4@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Dumas

83586 Cold Springs Lane

Florence, OR 97439

From: David Scherer <dscherer2@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Scherer

500 Shaindel Dr

500 Shaindel Dr

Williamsburg, VA 23185

From: P C Gardiner <Pcgardiner@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is BAD plan

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

P C Gardiner

Corpus Christi, TX 78418

From: Elena Lemmo <elena1016@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Elena Lemmo

3119 Lynch St SW

Massillon, OH 44646

From: Tim Coen <tcoen825@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tim Coen

3119 Lynch Ave SouthWest

Mass, OH 44646

From: Molly Hauck <mollyhauck@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Molly Hauck

4004 Dresden St.

Kensington, MD 20895

From: Christine Bonnell <xinebonnell@Hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Christine Bonnell

224 Saint James Pl., Apt. 2-L

Brooklyn, NY 11238

From: Dean Borgeson <daborgeson@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dean Borgeson

9208 Erickson Ct N

9208 Erickson Ct N

Brooklyn Park, MN 55428

From: Donald Dimock <dond@minetfiber.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Donald Dimock

543 E. Clay St., Unit 5

Monmouth, OR 97361

From: John Lemmon <jlemmon@its.blrdoc.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Lemmon

154 Cumberland Gap Road

Nederland, CO 80466

From: renata dobryn <namach6@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

renata dobryn

6 Spruce Ln

Montauk, NY 11954

From: Evelyn McMullen <fahdutnik@charter.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Evelyn McMullen

549 Forest Ridge Ct.

549 Forest Ridge Ct..

Montgomery, AL 36109

From: Esther Lee <esther0707@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Esther Lee

Lunar Avenue

72 Lunar Ave

Braintree, MA 02184

From: olive jordan <olive@ejordan.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

olive jordan

464 main st

464 Main Street

port washington, NY 11050

From: Carl Carter <carlsfrog@mac.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Carl Carter

3164 SE Timberlake Dr

Hillsboro

Hillsboro, OR 97123

From: Patricia Marlatt <patriciamaratt@me.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Patricia Marlatt

3863 Fredonia Dr.

Los Angeles, CA 90068

From: Susan Luton <sluton@austin.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem.

"Interim" storage of high-level radioactive waste is not an acceptable fix for our country's broken nuclear waste program.

I urge you to favor millions of Americans and their health instead of the nuclear power industry. The long-term solution is to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Susan Luton

14701 CROSSCREEK

14701 Crosscreek

AUSTIN, TX 78737

From: susanne garbarini <dsagarbarini@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

suzanne garbarini

1050 quaker bridge rd

1050 quaker bridge rd., croton, ny

CROTON-ON-HUDSON, NY 10520

From: Sara Fisch <Sar768@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sara Fisch

9743 East Palm Ridge Drive

9743 East Palm Ridge Drive

Scottsdale, AZ 85260

From: Lynn Walker <mooncrone@mac.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lynn Walker

15901 Corsica Ave

Cleveland, OH 44110

From: Larry Dowdy <dowdylead@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Larry Dowdy

606 Meadow Lane SW

Vienna, VA 22180

From: Michael Wood <mpwood67@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Wood

834 Lincoln Ave.

834 lincoln ave.

Lancaster, OH 43130

From: Robert Segal <robsegal@optonline.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Robert Segal

39 Briarbrook Drive

Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510

From: Constance Birch <cwbirch319@juno.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Constance Birch

319 Mary Gray Lane

319 Mary Gray Lane

Staunton, VA 24401

From: mary burton riseley <mbriseley@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

mary burton riseley

box 179

box 179, cliff, nm 88028

cliff, NM 88028

From: Shirley Mays <bowen1992@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Shirley Mays

3229 N. Fairgroinds Rd.

P.O. Box 5682

Midland, TX 79704

From: WALTER HEBERLEIN <wheberle@tampabay.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

WALTER HEBERLEIN

5 GATESHEAD DR APT 215

APT 215

DUNEDIN, FL 34698

From: Bradley Boyden <bchrat24@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bradley Boyden

13861 Joyce Drive

Largo, FL 33774

From: Vonda Welty <vwelty@uoregon.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Vonda Welty

PO Box 3266/4096 E 17th Ave

Eugene, OR 97403

From: Dorothy Weber <dsweber@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Weber

2210 Moccasin

2210 Moccasin

MBoro, TN 37130

From: Bob Higgins <rlh974@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bob Higgins

2749 Ferncliff Ave

Dayton, OH 45420

From: Natylie Baldwin <natyliedb@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Natylic Baldwin

20800 Lake Chabot Road

#101

Castro Valley, CA 94546

From: roger booth <rogerlumbermill@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

roger booth

2755 s.m. street

springfield, OR 97477

From: Anita Wasserman <allanwass@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Anita Wasserman

44 Strawberry Hill #7G1

44 STRAWBERRY HILL AVE

Stamford, CT 06902

From: Aaron McGee <aaronmcgee@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radioactive waste is a dangerous, long-term problem

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aaron McGee

142 Dunning

142 Dunning

Madison, WI 53704

From: K. Chung <chungkat@gmx.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

K. Chung

2318 Kipona Place

Honolulu, HI 96816

From: lynn manzione <lynn.manzione@georgiacenter.uga.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. I don't want high-level radioactive waste traveling through my neighborhood, do you? No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

De-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution (found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative) would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

lynn manzione

1420 Newton Bridge Road

none

Athens, GA 30607

From: Ben Ruwe <benruwe@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ben Ruwe

10272 Lomita Ave.

Felton, CA 95018

From: Anita Wasserman <allanwass@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Anita Wasserman

44 Strawberry Hill #7G1

44 STRAWBERRY HILL AVE

Stamford, CT 06902

From: John Blanchette <johnblanchette@iopener.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Blanchette

7320 Glenroie Ave. 9H

Norfolk, VA 23505

From: Calvin Rittenhouse <foothillbilly@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Calvin Rittenhouse

397 Catherine St Apt 3

Apt 3

Columbus, OH 43223

From: Dave Hornstein <dhornstein152309MI@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dave Hornstein

1039 N. Old Woodward, Unit 7

Birmingham, MI 48009

From: Brad Jones <bradly_jones@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Brad Jones

2035 Blackmud Creek Drive

Edmonton, AB T6W 1E7

From: Chuck Graver <cgraver@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Chuck Graver

32 Cotherstone Dr.

32 Cotherstone Dr.

Southampton, NJ 08088

From: J Gary Droege <gdroege@twcny.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

J Gary Droege

10 Parkington Cir

10 Parkington Cir

East Syracuse, NY 13057

From: Thomas Windberg <tjwindberg@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Thomas Windberg

2416 Pace Bend Rd S

Spicewood, TX 78669

From: Bettie Reina <bjbr935@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bettie Reina

PO box 191

570 High St.

Milmay, NJ 08340

From: Jennifer Griffith <jbgrif@mindspring.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Griffith

315 Obie Dr.

Durham, NC 27713

From: Rebecca Miller <reebeea@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Miller

O'Fallon, MO 63368

From: Bastiaan van Dalen <bastiaanmusic@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bastiaan van Dalen

po box 72

Mylestom, ot 2454

From: Robert and Helen Buttel <rhbuttel@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Robert and Helen Buttel

766 S. Front St.

766 South Front Street

Philadelphia, PA 19147

From: Paul Mayer <paul@viewdrive.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Paul Mayer

108 Rainbow Dr #825

108 Rainbow Dr #825

Livingston, TX 77351

From: janice palma-glennie <palmtree7@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please go back to the drawing board and get rid of the current "discussion draft".

thank you again for your diligence.

Sincerely,

janice palma-glennie

pobox 4849

kailua-kona, HI 96740

From: Richard Firth <Editorialist43@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Richard Firth

10111 Holly Road

Mechanicsville, VA 23116

From: John Barkhausen <jsb@madriver.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John Barkhausen

72 Lois Lane

72 Lois Lane

Warren, VT 05674

From: Richard Firth <Editorialist43@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Richard Firth

10111 Holly Road

Mechanicsville, VA 23116

From: charles kennedy <RobKenedy3@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

charles kennedy

5566 covert drive

5566 covert drive

columbus, OH 43231

From: Dorieta Rogers <dorieta@suddenlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dorieta Rogers

4205 96th St

4205 96th

Lubbock, TX 79423

From: Patrick De La Garza Und Senkel <Patrick_DeLaGarzaUndSenkel@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Patrick De La Garza Und Senkel

2036 South 5th Street, #11

McAllen, TX 78503

From: Dorieta Rogers <dorieta@suddenlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dorieta Rogers

4205 96th St

4205 96th

Lubbock, TX 79423

From: Marilyn Waltasti <mwaltasti@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Marilyn Waltasti

42965 W. Magic Moment Drive

Maricopa, AZ 85138

From: joyce niksic <jniksic450989279@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

joyce niksic

7429 Woodmar

7429 Woodmar

Hammond, IN 46323

From: Kevin Rolfes <kevin@rolfes.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kevin Rolfes

14006 N Green Hills Loop

Austin, TX 78737

From: Mary Ann Rotondo <marot1421@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Ann Rotondo

4641 Logan Court

4641 Logan Court

Schwenksville, PA 19473

From: Storm Cunningham <storm@recitizen.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Storm Cunningham

2426 N. Powhatan St.

Arlington, VA 22207

From: Patricia O'Leary <Psoleary@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Patricia O'Leary

6010 Westchester Park

6010 Westchester Park

COLLEGE PARK, MD 20740

From: Dudley and Candace Campbell <cdcampbl@roadrunner.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dudley and Candace Campbell

13167 Ortley Place

Valley Glen, CA 91401

From: Shiu Hung <shiuhung@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Shiu Hung

874 Carnival Rd SE

1745 A Croner Avenue

Palm Bay, FL 32909

From: Erv Amdahl <eamdahl@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Erv Amdahl

5111 San Carlos

Sierra Vista, AZ 85650

From: Joanie Laine <jlaine1@mac.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joanie Laine

15500 Bubbling Wells Rd. #182

#182

Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240

From: Homer Ferguson <amoobrasil@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Those who worship the power of wealth are indifferent to the gravity of our radioactive waste program. How can one falsely claim to be a "representative" of We the People, yet be so callous that he does not revile anyone supporting the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation?

Move lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site? How craven! No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security can responsibly mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly.

Only one move must be allowed: the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. After that, we should be, like Germany, making nuclear energy obsolete through the use of inexhaustible solar & wind energy.

Any de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution (think recyclable energy) found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

Please be a servant to our country and its public health, its environmental protection, and its future.

It is unconscionable to enrich and reward the nuclear power industry for wreaking destruction on our homeland.

Focus on phasing out the use of nuclear power, replacing it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Our country has an abundance of the necessary resources. Why not use them?

Thank you for your consideration.

Homer Ferguson

206 Brushy Creek Lane

Apt 304

Nashville, TN 37211

From: Theresa Lianzi <terrlia@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Theresa Lianzi

1400 S. Ocean Drive

Apt. 1504

Hollywood, FL 33019

From: Ronald Christensen <ergoz@mac.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ronald Christensen

1610 East 2nd Street

Apt. 3

Brooklyn, NY 11230

From: Dave Potvin <potvind@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dave Potvin

1032 Redgate Ave.

Norfolk, VA 23507

From: Matthew Golub <matt_golub@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Matthew Golub

3110 Park Ave

APT 1

Richmond, VA 23221

From: Matthew Johnson <ma.scud@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Matthew Johnson

1133 Hollow Creek Dr.

Apt 201

Austin, TX 78705

From: Matthew Golub <matt_golub@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Matthew Golub

3110 Park Ave

APT 1

Richmond, VA 23221

From: John Moszyk <johnmoszyk48@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Moszyk

4278 Bordeaux

4278 Bordeaux

St Louis, MO 63129

From: Millicent Sims <menucha65@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Millicent Sims

12 Roosevelt Place

n/a

Montclair, NJ 07042

From: Matthew Shapiro <MattShap@njto.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Matthew Shapiro

500 Linwood Dr Apt 5C

Apt 5C

Fort Lee, NJ 07024

From: Carol Metzger <aa4kp@genset.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Carol Metzger

954 Perkins Rd.

Kents Store, VA 23084

From: Shirley Davis <shirley.davis@umit.maine.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Shirley Davis

64 Gardner Road

64 Gardner Road

Orono, ME 04473

From: carol jagiello <cjags91@optonline.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

carol jagiello

91 wood pl

bloomingtondale, NJ 07403

From: Star Jameson <tsitlali@montana.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Star Jameson

253 Roosevelt Lane

Hamilton, MT

Hamilton, MT 59840

From: Grover Syck <groversyck@fuse.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Grover Syck

4130 Bennett Dr

4130 Bennett dr

Hamilton, OH 45011

From: Jonathan Nash <jnash67@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jonathan Nash

500 East 83rd Street, #10B

New York, NY 10028

From: Mary McMahan <marymcmahan@greynun.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mary McMahan

1750 Quarry Rd.

1750 Quarry Rd.

Yardley, PA 19067

From: Dr. William 'Skip' Dykoski <skipdykoski@usfamily.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dr. William 'Skip' Dykoski

890 9th Ave NW

890 9th Ave NW

New Brighton, MN 55112

From: Donna Carr, M.D. <DonnaCarrMD@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Donna Carr, M.D.

1201 Sidonia St.

Encinitas, CA 92024

From: P Morello <fastphyl1@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

P Morello

984 Harrison Ferry

White Pine, TN 37890

From: Nicholas Merry <nmerry1@binghamton.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Merry

Johnson City, NY 13790

From: Jeffrey Garrison <Jgarrison1988@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeffrey Garrison

5404 Squaw Valley Trail

Virginia Beach, VA 23464

From: K Krupinski <kkbluerose@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

K Krupinski

6124 Buena Vista Terrace

392 E. Palm St

LA, CA 90042

From: Elisse De Sio <elissedesio@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Elisse De Sio

P.O. Box 620108

P.O. Box 620108

Woodside, CA 94062

From: Patricia Walters <pwalters7391@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patricia Walters

6199 E. Broadway #122

6199 E.. Broadway #122

Tucson, AZ 85712

From: Kevin Macdonald <KevinMac2@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kevin Macdonald

P. O. Box 198

Belgrade Lakes, ME 04918

From: Henry Harris <hvh.harris@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Henry Harris

3341 St. Albans Dr.

Los Alamitos, CA 90720

From: Katherine O'Sullivan <xkosullivan@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Katherine O'Sullivan

1825 Riverside drive

New York, NY 10034

From: Bill Gibson <billgbsn@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bill Gibson

32353 San Juan Creek Rd #207

San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675

From: Dave Seaborg <davidseaborg@juno.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dave Seaborg

1888 Pomar Way

Walnut Creek, CA 94598

From: Darrell Clarke <darrell@dclarke.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Darrell Clarke

27560 Ruby Lane

Castaic, CA 91384

From: Richard Kuszmar <linneamari@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Richard Kuszmar

11816 Valley Blvd.

11816 Valley Blvd

Warren, MI 48093

From: Lori Blauwet <blauwet.lori@mayo.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lori Blauwet

1216 9th Ave NW

Rochester, MN 55902

From: Anthony Montapert <amontapert@roadrunner.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Anthony Montapert

1375 Ficus Way

11160 Valley Spring Place

Ventura, CA 93004

From: M innie (Mini) Richards <chicfineart@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

M innie (Mini) Richards

1882 W. Lantana Dr.

1882 W. Lantana Dr.

Chandler, AZ 85248

From: Earle Kasregis <ekasregis@roadrunner.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Earle Kasregis

223 Roxbury Notch Rd.

Roxbury, ME 04275

From: Bruce Jenkins <bjenksp@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bruce Jenkins

907 Tanager Ct

907 Tanager Ct

Sunnyvale, CA 94087

From: James Mulder <jhmulder@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Mulder

28 Sachson Pl

Wappingers Falls, NY 12590

From: Edward Bielaus <ljbar@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Edward Bielaus

6912 Breezewood ter

Rockville, MD 20852

From: James Jensen <fircrkr@charter.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Jensen

531 29th Street NW

Rochester, MN 55901

From: Jeannine LeMay <wolfdenz@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeannine LeMay

4100 Leigh Lane

5434 W. Blue Indigo

Alta, WY 83414

From: Charlie McCullagh <c.mtoole@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Charlie McCullagh

311 river rd

red bank, NJ 07701

From: Pt Musick <musickstudio@juno.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future--including the very far future. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

My personal comments follow, below, in this excerpt from an essay I wrote about radioactive waste storage at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico. Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely, Pat Musick

"...Long thought lifeless, the vast underground spaces of Carlsbad Caverns are alive with an astonishing diversity of microscopic life. Conversely, an enormous, manmade underground space not far from Carlsbad is the repository for tons upon tons of toxic radioactive waste. WIPP—the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant—is eight miles of tunnels nearly half a mile below the earth's surface, carved out of 250-million-year-old rock salt. This is the permanent storage site for "transuranic" nuclear waste: clothing, rags,

tools, debris, and other “disposable” items contaminated with radioactive elements (mostly plutonium). Such manmade transuranic elements have higher atomic numbers than uranium. These items, accumulated since the 1940s, can remain radioactive for a long time; plutonium isotope half-lives can last from twenty minutes to 76 million years. WIPP is intended to store this waste safely, away from humans, for ten thousand years. Until 1999, it was stored in temporary places all over the country. Temporary storage is not very reassuring. Release—whether accidental (fire, flood, tornado) or deliberate, as with terrorism—is always a possibility. Radiation poisoning from this stuff would be slow and insidious: genetic damage, cancers.

The drums of waste will eventually be encased in salt, as the formation closes itself in and seals around them. Since rock salt “self-heals,” this formation, the Salado, is considered geologically stable. If cracks appear in the bedrock, they close up on their own. Originally, the Environmental Protection Agency ruled that hazardous and radioactive wastes must not “migrate” (leak). That requirement was later removed by court order, then act of Congress; other radioactive waste safety requirements “provide adequate protection for human health and the environment,” according to a WIPP brochure. “Migration of radioactive materials” is no longer directly, legally prohibited . . . probably because, over thousands of years, there's no way to enforce it.

The Salado Formation is salt from the same ancient sea whose limestone deposits formed the uplifted reef that's honeycombed with caverns comprising Carlsbad and other cave systems...

Yet not only geology, but biology—the living world—impacts the stability of this radioactive-waste tomb. A world of solid salt deep underground might seem an unlikely place to support life, yet thriving populations of microorganisms live in this subterranean salt. Halophiles (salt-loving microbes) populate the Salado Formation, as they do the Great Salt Lake, the Dead Sea, and salt flats around the world. Laboratory investigations of microbes taken from the WIPP site reveal that these archaea and bacteria become actively involved with the introduced radioactive substances. Some microbes transform uranium compounds into other compounds. In some cases, uranium precipitates out. Some “bind” uranium in and on their cells; this bacterially immobilized uranium is easily released through the action of bicarbonates. The implications of all this biotransformation may not be known for centuries. Underlying the whole principle of storing nuclear waste at WIPP is the belief that this ancient salt formation's environment is stable, unchanging, and sterile. That assumption was made before anyone knew the salt was alive with halophiles, let alone that they'd bind, precipitate out, and even transform what was being stored. If microscopic life has been part of the Salado Formation's geologic stability all along, what happens to that stability with the introduction of this new factor? Life, no matter how small, is a wild card in calculating what happens over the long term.

...At the U.S. Department of Energy WIPP Information Center, one display panel—describing the 55-gallon drums of waste, banded in groups of seven, stacked three high—explains, “On top is magnesium oxide, which limits the movement of radionuclides in the unlikely event that brine (water saturated with salt) should enter the repository during the next 10,000 years.” Is it hubris, or just frighteningly naive, to speculate about what might be an “unlikely” event in a ten-thousand-year time span? Ten thousand years in the past was the end of the Pleistocene, the last great ice age. The earliest

known beginnings of agriculture—the cultivation of food grains, the domestication of animals—were then beginning to appear in the Tigris and Euphrates Valleys. It seems a bit of a stretch to attempt to think as far into the future as the earliest known agriculture is in the past.

Storing something that will still be toxic in ten thousand years presents a compelling design challenge. The use of writing systems only started appearing five and a half thousand years ago. Paleographers—scholars of ancient writing—point out that the Roman alphabet was perfected little more than two thousand years ago; the English language only reached its more-or-less present form within about the last six hundred years. What constitutes a poison warning label that will be intelligible in ten thousand years?

Congress mandated that warning markers for the WIPP site be designed and put in place. A panel convened to brainstorm possible future scenarios and to develop recommendations for such markers. Members were experts in areas including materials science, anthropology, astronomy, archaeology, linguistics, architecture, environmental design, and geomorphology. Fine art was disqualified; the late twentieth-century art scene's "anti-scientific, anti-representational" leanings were cited, with the dire prediction that if it were left to artists, the site would end up being marked by a giant inflatable hamburger. A scientific illustrator was included, but no graphic designers (those whose profession is communication via symbols). None of the invited women chose to join the panel.

The final plan calls for a five-tier system of warning markers. One tier is a berm of salt, stone and earth, encircling the center of the sixteen-square-mile site. Monoliths bearing warnings are to be placed at points along the perimeter. Information centers—both above ground and buried—will display informative and warning text in pictographs, Navajo, and the six official United Nations languages (English, Spanish, French, Russian, Arabic, and Chinese). Throughout the area, radar-reflecting and permanent magnetic objects are to be buried, to alert any excavators that something's there.

Although the panelists' work and the implementation plan are thoughtful and detailed, attempting to communicate ten thousand years into the future seems a fool's errand. Still, the very effort to think far into the future—as opposed to making all decisions based on the economics of quarterly stockholders' reports or the politics of the next election—is a surprisingly noble, sweet, and human endeavor for a government entity at the turn of the third millennium. As William Blake wrote, "if the fool persists in his folly, he will become wise." It's an honorable archetype, the Wise Fool.

The proposed warning markers assume that humans will be reading them. Although the panelists discussed scenarios of extraterrestrials coming upon the site, they refrained from attempting communication with such beings. And, in a few thousand years, who knows? Some futurists predict that human population centers will shift to other planets. Whether or not that happens, mass extinctions have wiped out Earth's dominant life forms before; the same could happen to humans. The original emergence of life on Earth appeared in the form of microbes very like the ones that still flourish in today's boiling sulfur springs, methane vents, and salt formations. Even many arthropods, from cockroaches to horseshoe crabs, have existed in the same basic form through hundreds of millions years

of environmental changes—far longer than either dinosaurs or humans. But ten thousand years might not be quite enough time for cockroaches to evolve into paleographers.

Pt Musick

10 Studio Place

10 Studio Place

Colorado Springs, CO 80904

From: Emily Lubahn <elubahn@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways—even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Emily Lubahn

5338 Wolf Rd

Erie, PA 16505

From: pat kelly <pkelly31@juno.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

pat kelly

2932 highland avenue

2932 Highland Avenue

sacramento, CA 95818

From: Susan Watts <susanmwr@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Susan Watts

16217 Sunset Trail

16217 Sunset Trail

Riverside, CA 92506

From: James Kofron <jkofron@rochester.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Kofron

184 Belmore Way

184 Belmore Way

Rochester, NY 14612

From: Roxanne Warren <rwaa@erols.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Roxanne Warren

523 West 112th Street #72

New York, NY 10025

From: Laura Silverman <lgsilverman@optonline.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Laura Silverman

30 Rose Road

West Nyack, NY 10994

From: Dan Karney <dankarney124@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dan Karney

424 Lynetree Drive

424 Lynetree Drive

West Chester, PA 19380

From: James Wagner <JimWagner@safe-mail.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap the Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem.

Our nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, and fixing it should be of utmost priority.

I write to say that the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable.

No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly.

While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site.

Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation.

The key issue is that a consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Furthermore, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution, found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative, would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program.

The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Wagner

4897 E Walnut St

Westerville, OH 43081

From: Kaiba White <kaibawhite@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kaiba White

1307 Barton Hills Dr

1307 Barton Hills Dr Apt 8

Austin, TX 78704

From: Michael Gilgun <mgilgun@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Gilgun

925 Monterey Ct.

925 Monterey Ct.

Chula Vista, CA 91911

From: Mike Smith <mike55smith@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mike Smith

1531 1st Ave

Seattle, WA 98101

From: John Crotty <jmcrotty1467@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Crotty

1467 Cherry Creek Lane

Manchester, MO 63021

From: P Scoville <michael799@optonline.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

P Scoville

1554 Greenwood Lake Tpke

1

Hewitt, NJ 07421

From: Michele Nihipali <nihipalim001@hawaii.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michele Nihipali

54-074 A Kam Hwy

54-074 A Kam Hwy

Hauula, HI 96717

From: Judy Genandt <j.genandt@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Judy Genandt

710 Timothy Ct.

710 Timothy Ct.

East Dundee, IL 60118

From: Peter M. Ludwig <petermludwig@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Peter M. Ludwig

2665 Yates

2665 Yates St.

DENVER, CO 80212

From: Sandra Atkins <malibusandy@hughes.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sandra Atkins

N5428 24th Ave #127

Wild Rose, WI 54984

From: Shiu Hung <shiuhung@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Shiu Hung

874 Carnival Rd SE

1745 A Croner Avenue

Palm Bay, FL 32909

From: Gloria Gannaway <globogal@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gloria Gannaway

3002 Oak Park Dr.

Austin, TX 78704

From: Trent Block <block2u@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Trent Block

P.O. Box 5823

Incline Village, NV 89450

From: Tanya Roland <jmenmo@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

In the long run, nuclear energy is not an eco-friendly, benign source of energy and should be phased out as soon as possible.

In the short term nuclear waste should be kept far away from water, humans and animals. It should NOT be subsidized by the government. Great efforts and resources should be put into finding a means to pacify the destructive/deeply toxic nature of nuclear waste...again, as it is phased out.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tanya Roland

2785 Devonshire Ct

Falls Church, VA 22042

From: Paul Roden <paul.roden@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Paul Roden

307 Dalview Drive

307 Dalview Drive

Yardley, PA 19067

From: Janice Gloe <rainglo@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Janice Gloe

3100 Guido Street

Oakland, CA 94602

From: David Miller <davidmiller4444@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Miller

7 Kroft Court

Huntington, NY 11743

From: Edwin Miller <edwinred@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Edwin Miller

20329 Madison Street

none

Torrance, CA 90503

From: Leona Klerer <leona@klerer.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Leona Klerer

71 Straw Hill Ave

Street Address 2

Stamford, CT 06902

From: Ned Coates <blazecee@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ned Coates

154 English Hill Rd

Cogan Station, PA 17728

From: Scott Rubel <scott@invitesite.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Scott Rubel

977 Montecito Dr.

977 Montecito Dr.

Los Angeles, CA 90031

From: George Kaufer <george.kaufer@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

George Kaufer

146 Lakefront Rd.

146 Lakefront Rd.

Putnam Valley, NY 10579

From: Marguerite King <valdetara@mhcable.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

I AM OLD ENOUGH TO REMEMBER THE BIRTH OF NUCLEAR ENERGY PLANTS AND BOMBS. IN THOSE YEARS ONE IN 300 PEOPLE GOT CANCER. NOW THE NUMBER IS 1 IN 3 OR 4. NOW DRILLERS ARE LOBBYING TO PUT MORE RADIATION FROM FRACKING FLUIDS IN WATER TO ADD TO THE OVERWHELMING STOCKPILING AND EXPOSURE PEOPLE HAVE TO RADIATION.

THE WAY TO AVOID PROBLEMS IS TO NOT INVEST IN INDUSTRIES IN WHICH THERE IS NO WAY OF DISPOSING OF THE WASTE.

RENEWABLE ENERGY AND COMMON SENSE. JOBS, CLEANER AIR AND WATER, FEWER SICK PEOPLE, AND A WAY TO GET OUR ECONOMY BACK IN BALANCE. MY GOD, IF GERMANY AND CHINA CAN DO IT, WHY DON'T WE? THIS IS A NO BRAINER.

Sincerely,

Marguerite King

3480 Schoharie Turnpike

3480 Schoharie Turnpike

Earlton,, NY 12058

From: Jeff Lowry <jlowry999@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeff Lowry

1189 Zucco Lane

1189 Zucco Lane

Johnstown, PA 15905

From: Robert Heron <rcheron@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Robert Heron

10941 Sproul Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90064

From: David Modarelli <davemodarelli@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Modarelli

3125 Vermont Place

Akron, OH 44312

From: John c <jcareysr@netscape.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

John c

17696 comana terrace

17696 Cumana Terrace

San Diego, CA 92128

From: chuck countryman <oldshrouded1@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

chuck countryman

p.o. box 117

p.O. box 117

rock creek, OH 44084

From: Saab Lofton <saablofton@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Saab Lofton

619 Third Avenue

Seattle, WA 98104

From: Stephen Nolan <rainb0wne0s@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Stephen Nolan

5609 Southampton Dr.

Springfield, VA 22151

From: William Stahl <bharani51@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

William Stahl

18045 Apt B Third Ave

Jamestown, CA 95327

From: William Swyers <phrms@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

William Swyers

3109 Grove Ave

Richmond, VA 23221

From: alice slater <aslater@rcn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

alice slater

446 e 86 st

ny, NY 10028

From: Jacob Feldman <mzeejake@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jacob Feldman

711 Murray Ave.

San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

From: John Sodrel <jesodrel@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Sodrel

1032 Cliffwood Drive

New Albany, IN 47150

From: David Osterhoudt <dostermail@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Osterhoudt

21022 Los Alisos Blvd., Apt. 214

Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688

From: Alice Kelly <alicemarykelly@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Alice Kelly

6493 Cooper St.

Felton, CA 95018

From: Elizabeth Fein <lizamy928@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Fein/Stein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Elizabeth Fein

225 Adams St Apt 4C

225 adams st. 4c

Brooklyn, NY 11201

From: Barbara Seaman <seacob@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Barbara Seaman

147 N. French St.

Alexandria, VA 22304

From: Mark Reback <mark@consumerwatchdog.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mark Reback

1606 N. Avenue 55

Los Angeles, CA 90042

From: Joseph Luchman <jluchman@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joseph Luchman

10310 Luria Commons Court

Burke, VA 22015

From: Henry Coleman <henryandleslie@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Henry Coleman

606 College Terrace

606 College Terrace, Williamsburg, Va. 23185

Williamsburg, VA 23185

From: Esther Nelson <mfeecn@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Esther Nelson

1311 Telfair Way

1311 Telfair Way

Charleston, SC 29412

From: Marie Russell-Barker <russell.464@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Marie Russell-Barker

4941 W. Jackson Blvd.

4941 W. Jackson Blvd.

Chicago, IL 60644

From: Judith Bohler <judy.bohler@alvernia.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Judith Bohler

220 Meadowlark Drive

220 Meadowlark Drive

Ephrata, PA 17522

From: Salvatore Casano <sal4vera@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Salvatore Casano

430 Coburg Village Way

Rexford, NY 12148

From: Bertha Kriegler <bkriegler@juno.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative. This unsolved problem of radioactive waste should be a warning - no more nuclear power plants. We need to go green!

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bertha Kriegler

527 Plymouth ave

none

Schenectady, NY 12308

From: Charles Wirth <pcw577@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Charles Wirth

605 Judson Ave

605 Judson Ave

Hurley, SD 57036

From: Andria Herron <chefandria@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Andria Herron

1819 NE CLEMENS ST

BREMERTON, WA 98310

From: Scott Jenkins <sjenkins111@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Scott Jenkins

po box 15557

SLO, CA 93401

From: John Carter <jcarter@cap.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Please do your job and DON'T kick the can down the road. No interim solution, only a final one will do. And in the mean time, we should be doing everything possible to NOT generate more waste! No more nuclear weapons, no more nuclear power, no more re-processing.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Carter

22118 W. Spruce Dr.

22118 W. Spruce Dr.

Antioch, IL 60002

From: Frank Talbot <rtalbot@vtti.vt.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Frank Talbot

3271 Mount Zion Road

Blacksburg, VA 24060

From: Jack David Marcus <jackdavidm@nyc.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jack David Marcus

215 West 92nd Street Apt. 15E

215 West 92nd Street Apt. 15E

New York, NY 10025

From: Louis G. Albano <lga31413@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Louis G. Albano

314 13 Street

Brooklyn, NY 11215

From: John Champine <johnlc41@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Champine

4179 Palau Drive

4179 Palau Drive

Sarasota, FL 34241

From: Erik Schnabel <erikschnabel@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Erik Schnabel

413 E. Baltimore St.

Greencastle, PA 17225

From: Jean Waller <jeanwaller@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jean Waller

5208 N. Sawyer Ave, #2

#2

Chicago, IL 60625

From: Elan Carlson <sqwrds@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Elan Carlson

562-D S Sawmill Cove

#2038

Cottonwood, AZ 80920

From: Dan Brown <danbrown@jobsfirst.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dan Brown

405 Raleigh St

Bluefield, WV 24701

From: KERRY MADIGAN <KERRY@MADROSE.COM>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

KERRY MADIGAN

1219 ROUTE 83

1219 route 83

PINE PLAINS, NY 12567

From: Larry Siegel <lrrysgl@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Larry Siegel

2113 Fox Run Drive

2113 Fox Run Drive

Plainsboro, NJ 08536

From: Ann Asnes <annasnes@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ann Asnes

185 Bellevue Road

185 Bellevue Road

Watertown, MA 02472/4902

From: Earl Rexrode <rexohrex@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Earl Rexrode

1065 Highlands Dr.

C

Charlottesville, VA 22901

From: Timothy Foley <TFoley5000@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Timothy Foley

2025 NW Hickory Lane

Apt#2

Ankeny, IA 50023

From: David Johnson <nerv2211@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Johnson

713 Water Street

Marinette, WI 54143

From: Cedar Moss <CEDARMOSS@GMAIL.COM>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

I can not believe any leader would be so irresponsible as to allow the creation of a waste that they have no idea what to do with it and the ramifications of it are so far beyond imagining. passing on to future generations a terrible nightmare with thoughts only of their own profit now. It is beyond my

comprehension that any leader would do such a thing. Please please please take your place as a leader we can trust and do what is right for the people the land and for many generations to come.

Thanks, Cedar

. tThank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Cedar Moss

Mt Shasta City, CA 96067

From: Carol Scher <cmwscher@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carol Scher

2273 Norman Ct.

Eureka, CA 95503

From: Jeanie Johnson <jeanie.newlife@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jeanie Johnson

3221 Village Ct

3221 Village Ct. #1

Janesville, WI 53546

From: Chung-Wei Chan <chungwei.chan@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Chung-Wei Chan

1590 Clarkspur Lane

1590 Clarkspur Lane

95129, CA 95129

From: Jason Hutchins <hutchins.j@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jason Hutchins

102 N Cedar Ln

upper darby, PA 19082

From: Rebecca Kahn <rkahn@citizen.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rebecca Kahn

10301 strathmore hall st

purchase

rockville, MD 20852

From: Jamie Burks <jburks@philabundance.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jamie Burks

8542 Trumbauer Dr.

Wyndmoor, PA 19038

From: Carol Collins <ccollins54@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Carol Collins

1935 Nault Road

Street Address 2

Dover, DE 19904

From: B. Thomas Diener <texasbtdiener@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

B. Thomas Diener

405 Zena Lona Street Northeast

Unit E

Albuquerque, NM 87123

From: Ben Lovejoy <benlovejoy@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

We can't even figure out how to build a sign for nuclear waste dumps that will last 1000s of years. We don't know how to warn people in the distant future that may not understand an ancient language like English. Nature can't read!

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ben Lovejoy

4475 Traffic Way

4475 Traffic Way Atascadero California 93422

Atascadero, CA 93422

From: Al Jones <jo320@mindspring.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Al Jones

4716 Ludwell Branch Court

Raleigh, NC 27612

From: Rebecca Kahn <rkahn@citizen.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rebecca Kahn

10301 strathmore hall st

purchase

rockville, MD 20852

From: Jean Gore <jeangore@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jean Gore

350 Ponca Pl. #175

Boulder, CO 80303

From: Fern Katz <faygy1@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Fern Katz

Fairfax Street, Southfield, MI

Southfield, MI 48076`

From: Michele Reed <mreed819@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michele Reed

P.O. Box 157

P.O. Box 157

Templeton, CA 93465

From: James Hamilton <hjames328@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

James Hamilton

2412 Palos Verdes Dr.W.

Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274

From: Joseph Thompson <joerthompson@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joseph Thompson

W13761 Blue Heron Lane

Tigerton, WI 54486

From: Gloria Cameron <MissGehra@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gloria Cameron

109 Crestwood Dr.

New Castle, PA 16101

From: Jolynn Loftus <Jolynnloftus@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jolynn Loftus

1200 Offutt Dr.

Falls Church, VA 22046

From: Antonella Nielsen <antonellanielsen@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Antonella Nielsen

R rsangervej 47

Copenhagen, ot 2400

From: Don Mallinson <dmallinson@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

No interim sites. Permanent storage only. Suck it up and not kick the can further.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Don Mallinson

746b Carriage Shop Rd

E Falmouth, MA 02536

From: Laura Silverman <lgsilverman@optonline.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Laura Silverman

30 Rose Road

West Nyack, NY 10994

From: Barbara Warren <warrenba@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Feedback on Radioactive Waste policy

Attachments: Final Comments on Interim Consolidated Storage Senate Bill.docx

US Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

We are enclosing our comments on the draft policy document and proposed bill.

Thank you for your consideration.

Barbara Warren

Citizens' Environmental Coalition

From: Anthony Montapert <amontapert@roadrunner.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Anthony Montapert

1375 Ficus Way

1375 Ficus Way

Ventura, CA 93004

From: Frances Mendenhall <freancesmendenhall@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Frances Mendenhall

3715 Hamilton

Omaha, NE 68131

From: Holly Rose <hrose28@cfl.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Holly Rose

308 Due East

308 Due East Avenue

New Smyrna Beach, FL 32169

From: nancy nolan <nancy@nolanconsulting.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

nancy nolan

225 West Mariposa

San Clemente, CA 92672

From: Bruce Barry <bkbarry@suffolk.lib.ny.us>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bruce Barry

20 Black Locust Ave

East Setauket, NY 11733

From: lise stoessel <lisebsbs@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

lise stoessel

335 Glade Lane

charlottesville, VA 22901

From: Darlene M Warnock <Darlene.Warnock@med.ge.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Darlene M Warnock

N49W27721 S. Courtland Circle

Pewaukee, WI 53072

From: Rebecca Kahn <rkahn@citizen.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rebecca Kahn

10301 strathmore hall st

purchase

rockville, MD 20852

From: Karen Vasily <kvas77@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Karen Vasily

306 Rogers Road

n/a

Eagleview, PA 19403

From: Elaine Wilson <elaine1111@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Elaine Wilson

2357 Del Amo

Torrance, CA 90501

From: Mary Ellen Piper <flamellon@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mary Ellen Piper

221 Current Dr

Newton, NJ 07860

From: Maxine Kaiser <kaiserme@q.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Maxine Kaiser

550 South 400 East

#3403

Salt Lake City, UT 84111

From: Patrick Dreier <patrick.dreier@gmx.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

Tritium resources are not endless. Nuclear fusion is not clean energy, nuclear waste, Tritium can go in environment radioactive contamination.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with cleaner energy sources priority renewables energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patrick Dreier

Industrie 10

Industrie 10, ot 2114

From: Charlotte Pirch <dpirch@socal.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Pirch

9826 Lewis Ave

Fountain Valley, CA 92708

From: Janet Miller <jaynet5950@mac.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

The time is long overdue for us to deal with the very real and permanent problem of nuclear waste. Interim solutions only avoid dealing with this. We should find a way to get out of nuclear energy production and stop deluding ourselves about this horrible industry.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Janet Miller

8927 Andersonville Rd

Dillwyn, VA 23936

From: Gayle Janzen <cgjanzen@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: The Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

We need a real solution for our high-level radioactive waste program and the Energy Committee's discussion draft is NOT the answer and will only exacerbate the problems. It's great that you are focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority.

Moving around high level waste to a consolidated interim site is a really bad idea on so many levels. We need permanent final locations, no interim sites and the waste needs to be moved as short a distance as possible. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. Security and accidents would be easily caused with moving this stuff around. Please find a more permanent and less deadly solution than what you're proposing.

While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gayle Janzen

11232 Dayton Av N

Seattle, WA 98133

From: Betsy Corner <betsycorner@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Betsy Corner

Colrain, MA 01340

From: Mark Laity-Snyder <marklaitys@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mark Laity-Snyder

1585 Stanley Branch Rd

Ferrum, VA 24088

From: Diana Lopez <dianalopez@swunion.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Diana Lopez

9443 Somerset Rd. #1

San Antonio, TX 78211

From: Holly Kukkonen <hakukkonen@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Holly Kukkonen

1607 Burns Ave.

1607 Burns Ave.

Iowa City, IA 52240

From: Mark Reback <mark@consumerwatchdog.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mark Reback

1606 N. Avenue 55

Los Angeles, CA 90042

From: george howard <georgehoward1@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

george howard

Milwaukie, OR 97267

From: terry vanderbush <tvanderbush@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

terry vanderbush

8237 2nd av. s.

Bloomington, MN 55420

From: tom sherman <tomsherman906@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:07 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

tom sherman

4856 n santa monica

4856 santa monica

mil, WI 53217

From: Dennis Welch <blakeprof@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

The Senate committee's draft would unfortunately serve mainly the interests of the nuclear power industry, which is already heavily subsidized by the US taxpayer. Even worse, the draft does too little to establish relevant policies and procedures to safeguard the environment and human lives from nuclear waste

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dennis Welch

Cary, NC 27519

From: donna green <donna.green@portlandoregon.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

donna green

15497 nw westbrook

1120 sw 5th ave

portland, OR 97204

From: Sharon Gillespie <pretend@austin.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sharon Gillespie

1103 Enfield Rd.

Austin, TX 78703

From: Bob Fischella <fischellab@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

** We spent a lot of money on Yucca Mountain, why not harder it and use it now until a better solution is available.**

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bob Fischella

6219 E. Via De La Yerba

Tucson, AZ 85750

From: Jeffrey Wanshel <jwanshel@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 3:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

As the NRC is well aware - because of this, they recently booted out their recent chairman, who is on record calling safety at nuclear power plants "a roll of the dice", because of nuclear waste - this problem makes any pretense of "national security" a laughable charade. With storage tanks crammed with by so much nuclear waste an accident at any plant could make uninhabitable more than one state, a third of nuclear power plants in the U.S. using the old GE deign which was just definitively proved to fail, if called upon, at Fukushima - our nuclear power and waste policy is a lethal shambles.

The rest is NIRS text with which I agree:

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Wanshel

1 Spanish Cove Rd.

Larchmont, NY 10538

From: Timothy Raymond <raymont@cityofrochester.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Timothy Raymond

45-1/2 Marshall St

Rochester, NY 14607

From: Gloria Foster <glofost@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gloria Foster

3906 Chatham Lane

Canandaigua, NY 14424

From: Geri Metz <gerimetz@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Geri Metz

P.O. Box 985

Mount Shasta, CA 96067

From: gin wilson <gin@virginiasilkart.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

gin wilson

2928 nw 51st terrace

margate, FL 33063

From: Deb and Arne Arnason <diamondteldeb@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable- Better WAY!!

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Deb and Arne Arnason

360 Webb Rd

Wadesboro, NC 28170

From: Leslie Schwarzbach <l-schwarzbach@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Leslie Schwarzbach

580 East Old Elm Rd.

Lake Forest, IL

Lake Forest, IL 60045

From: Corey E. Olsen <ceolsen@execpc.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the USA Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways, even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome, yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I urge you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program.

The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

I request that you scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Corey E. Olsen

W334S724 Cushing Park Rd.

CEO Pipe Organs/Golden Ponds Farm

Delafield, WI 53018

From: Shakima Jones <shakimajones@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Shakima Jones

42 Hull Street

42 Hull Street Brooklyn NY 11233

Brooklyn, NY 11233

From: Debra Rehn <BibleoGirl@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Debra Rehn

5130 SE 30th Av. #9

#9

Portland, OR 97202

From: Melinda Buckwalter <mbuckwa@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Melinda Buckwalter

6 Bug Hill Rd

Cummington, MA 01026

From: Marc Gripman <mdgripman@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marc Gripman

917 53rd St.

Oakland, CA 94608

From: Kevin Rolfes <kevin@rolfes.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kevin Rolfes

14006 N Green Hills Loop

Austin, TX 78737

From: Patrick Dreier <patrick.dreier@gmx.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with cleaner energy sources priority renewables energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patrick Dreier

Industrie 10

Industrie 10, ot 2114

From: E.S. SCHLOSS <ESS.007@RCN.COM>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

E.S. SCHLOSS

155 E. 93RD ST., #4A

155 E. 93RD ST., #4A

NY, NY 10128

From: Ken O'Connell <kmoconnell@smcm.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ken O'Connell

St. Mary's City, MD 20686

From: Christine Strickland <sixstringbandswife@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Christine Strickland

508 Tazewell Ave

Tazewell, VA 24651

From: stulips <stulips@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

stu lips

arthur

eugene, OR 97402

From: John Leinen <footpathpal@frontier.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John Leinen

14205 St. Croix trl N

Stillwater, MN 55082

From: Matthew Swyers <mswyers@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Matthew Swyers

1020 Dolores St #28

Livermore, CA 94550

From: Barbara Schwartz <vallabha@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Barbara Schwartz

3827 NE 17th St Cir

Ocala, FL 34470

From: Candi Ausman <crausman@wildmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Candi Ausman

4555 Thornton Ave Apt 62

Fremont, CA 94536

From: Joseph Wasserman <joewass64@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joseph Wasserman

87 Shadow Lane

87 Shadow Lane

West Hartford, CT 06110

From: Bronwen Evans <bronwynnevans@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bronwen Evans

#210-130 East 15th. Ave

cardiff

Vancouver, BC 98101

From: John Douglas <johndog@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John Douglas

PO Box 8552

Goleta, CA 93118

From: myosin@comcast.net

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:30 PM

Cc: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Waste management bill feedback

Attachments: NCEL Nuclear Safety Letter to NRC_UCSRev1_BF edits-1.docx

Thank you again for taking the time to talk with us on Monday regarding spent fuel pools and dry cask storage. I wanted to summarize our concerns in this formal letter to Senator Wyden and his staff that I've also cc'd to the feedback website that you suggested. I hope Senator Wyden will do the right thing and include language to thin spent fuel pools in the final draft of, or in an amendment to, this important legislation.

Thank you,

Chris and Emily Boniface and Joel Nigg

Portland, OR

Dear Senator Wyden and Staff,

The current 'discussion draft' of a comprehensive nuclear waste management bill released by you along with other senators does not include language that calls for the thinning of radioactive spent fuel pools at the 102 operating commercial nuclear reactors around the country.

A letter (see attached) on nuclear power safety, organized by the National Caucus of Environmental Legislators (NCEL) and signed by over 50 state legislators (including our own Jules Bailey), urged the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to address overcrowded spent fuel pools (similar to those seriously threatened during the Fukushima disaster) and to transfer much of this spent fuel to safer, more secure on-site dry cask storage.

According to independent institutions such as the National Academy of Sciences and the Union of Concerned Scientists, dry cask storage provides a number of key safety and security advantages. These experts say spent fuel pools lack diverse emergency cooling systems and are often located outside of robust containment structures. They also rely on electricity, and are thus vulnerable to events leading to power loss, such as severe weather, flooding, seismic activity and other natural disasters, as well as

terrorist strikes. These events could cause a loss of water from the pool and fuel damage and a potentially massive radiological release.

Dry casks, unlike the pools, are cooled by a "passive" air system that doesn't require electricity to operate. A case in point is the nuclear disaster at Fukushima: the safety of the spent fuel stored in the facility's dry casks was never in doubt during the accident.

Today, roughly 75% of the nation's 70,000 metric tons of high-level nuclear waste sit in these densely-packed spent fuel pools at reactor sites, putting millions of Americans at unnecessary risk. Thinning the spent fuel pools by accelerating the transfer to dry-cask storage is a sensible, straight forward measure that will significantly improve public health and safety while the waste is waiting to be moved offsite to interim or permanent storage (which, under the rosiest of scenarios, could be 15-20 yrs. away!). Indeed, the waste has to first be put into casks to be shipped off site so why not do that sooner rather than later?

As chairman of the Senate Energy & Natural Resources Committee, you will be instrumental in shaping this legislation and the absence of language addressing the near-term safety issues would be a glaring omission. We are urging you to include this language in the final bill that will go before the ENR committee in the next few weeks. If I can provide you with any further information, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Thank you,

Chris and Emily Boniface

1517 SE Salmon St.

Portland, OR 97214

Joel Nigg

8100 SW 6th Ave.

Portland, OR 97219

From: Ray Morris <rmorris@bak.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ray Morris

7

7319 Pembroke Ave.

Bakersfield, CA 93308

From: Dan Mack <danw.mack@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dan Mack

706 1st ave north

512

Minneapolis, MN 55403

From: Greg Schwartz <greg.m.schwartz@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Greg Schwartz

4876 Talmadge Park Row

San Diego, CA 92115

From: Doug Landau <popcomic@tampabay.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable. Why can't you protect people?

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Doug Landau

150 73rd St. S.

St. Petersburg, FL 33707

From: Bill Denneen <BDenneen@SLONET.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. I was arrested in front of Diablo (CA) because they did NOT know what they would do with their waste last that lasts for thousands of years. TODAY DIABLO STORES THEIR WASTE ON SITE on top of earthquake faults (like Japan) .

Scrap your "discussion draft" and START OVER !!.

Bill Denneen, Retired Bio. Prof., 1040 Cielo Lane, Nipomo, CA. 93444

Bill Denneen

1040 Cielo Lane

Nipomo, CA 93444

From: Paul Szymanowski <pszymanowski@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Paul Szymanowski

P.O. Box 74

P.O. Box 74

Curtice, OH 43412

From: Cathy Wootan <cwootan@wsem.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Cathy Wootan

3862 W. 20th St.

Cleveland, OH 44109

From: David Gardner <dgardner@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Gardner

2525 Beverly Ave #8

Santa Monica, CA 90405

From: Tim Seitz <tandjseitz@primus.ca>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It must be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is and has been indisputably broken from day one, but the Senate

Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems. They do not grasp the depth of the problem unfolding.

The best thing we can do now is to quit producing more high level nuclear waste ASAP.

I urge you to call for the ABOLITION of ALL Nuclear Fissioning Applications ASAP.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site wil only exacerbate the dilemma we are facing. It is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should ever mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry.. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Iterating, The best thing we can do now is to quit producing more high level nuclear waste ASAP.

I urge you to call for the ABOLITION of ALL Nuclear Fissioning Applications ASAP.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over bt facing the real dilemma of managing nuclear waste perpetually.

Sincerely,

Tim Seitz

5235 28th St

91 King Street East

Detroit, ON 48210

From: Rod McCoy <rmc_oi@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rod McCoy

2121 Vandivere Rd A-6

Augusta, GA 30904

From: JIM HEAD <JIMHEADJR@HOTMAIL.COM>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

JIM HEAD

15307 NORTHGATE

APT#102

OAK PARK, MI 48237

From: Tia Triplett <tia@anlf.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Tia Triplett

3959 Berryman Avenue

4073 Bledsoe Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90066

From: Susan Gill <sulac9@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Susan Gill

37 ross

san anselmo, CA 94960

From: Steve. Gaylord <snakebellysg@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Steve. Gaylord

37132 coyote lake rd

Newberry Springs, CA 92365

From: darius mitchell <dariusmitchell@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

darius mitchell

2727 w manor pl #202

2727 w manor pl

Seattle, WA 98199

From: Gracie Winters <g.winters@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:18 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gracie Winters

113 East Third Street

Newkirk, OK 74647

From: Robert Blake <blaker@health.missouri.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Robert Blake

2322 Meadow Lark Lane

Columbia, MO 65201

From: Rebecca Kahn <rkahn@citizen.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:17 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Scrap Consolidated Interim Storage Proposal

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome - yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry - which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rebecca Kahn

10301 strathmore hall st

purchase

rockville, MD 20852

From: bruce fukuji <bruce@fukuji.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

bruce fukuji

604 San Carlos Avenue

Albany, CA 94706

From: veronica hayes <veronicalhayes@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

veronica hayes

242 w. chesterfield

242 W. Chesterfield

Ferndale, MI 48220

From: Eric Spaeth <spaethee@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Nuclear Waste Discussion - Public Comment

Dear Senators,

Thank you for the opportunity to offer feedback about the Discussion Draft of your committee. I read part of it and what I saw looked promising.

I'd like to share with you a few of my concerns about nuclear waste storage.

1) I don't want nuclear waste, and I don't want to have to pay (directly or indirectly) for nuclear waste storage. I also don't want future generations to be burdened by what effectively amounts to the creation of an expanding, extremely long-term debt.

I currently get all my electricity through solar, wind and hydro, and the costs are less than what I was paying before for nuclear and coal. We don't need to keep making this waste.

2) In-site, out-of-mind. Nuclear waste is way to deadly and, generally, invisible, to be under the scrutiny of an inconspicuous watchdog process. I don't want to hear the excuses, "Our facility followed the procedures specified by the most respected experts in the field..." Surplus butter storage failures? Fine, even a careful policy can fail. Nuclear waste. There can be no excuses, and yet it's almost inevitable given the time spans involved.

3) Be humble and courageous, and seriously consider copying what Germany is doing in phasing out nuclear power.

4) Nuclear storage facilities and nuclear power plants look like giant bulls-eyes for terrorists. The results would be horrendous, calamitous, and the measures and costs to prevent such attacks have not begun to be considered. I note that the words "attack" and "terrorism" do not appear anywhere in your draft. How can that be?

5) Anyone who can't say the word "nuclear" should not have any part in shaping national nuclear policies. How can we have confidence in our government's taking this seriously if those in charge don't even know the word.

Thank you for your work and your consideration.

Sincerely,

Eric Spaeth

8138 Shawnee Street

Philadelphia, PA 19118

email:spaethee@hotmail.com

From: Darlene Jakusz <jdjakusz@wi-net.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Darlene Jakusz

8380 Ambrose Lane

Amherst Jct., WI 54407

From: Frederic Lassiter <flassiterjr@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Frederic Lassiter

205 Jacob Lane

Prescott, AZ 80301

From: Edwin Schlapfer <edschlapfer@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Edwin Schlapfer

P.O. Box 647

Ophir, CO 81426

From: Kenneth Bowman <kbowman@prodigy.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Bowman

2838 Rivers End Road

Orlando, FL 32817

From: Neil Bleifeld <Procrastus@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Neil Bleifeld

405 West 48th Street, #5FE

New York, NY 10036

From: Andrew Woitkoski <whoj2001@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Andrew Woitkoski

35 Kensington Ave

Pittsfield, MA 01201

From: Deb Lily <djlily13@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Deb Lily

567 Quinlan Ave. N.

Lakeland, MN 55043

From: Jill Simon <jillie.simon@endorphinrecords.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems!

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply UNACCEPTABLE.

- No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jill Simon

12 E. 14 St., 3E

NYC, NY 10003

From: nettie mc gee <mcge.nettie@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

nettie mc gee

n4639 St.H.76

shiocton, WI 54170

From: Bob Rankin <br6647@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bob Rankin

6652 Ruxton Ln

Austin, TX 78749

From: Marilyn Farmer <marilyn@habitatdesigns.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Farmer, AIA, LEED BD+C

Marilyn Farmer

1350 Marsh Street

San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

From: Gene and Dori Peters <petersgd@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

Please focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Thank you.

Peace!

Gene and Dori Peters

10149 W. Loma Blanca

Sun City, AZ 85351

From: Kevin Macdonald <Kevin.Macdonald@maine.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kevin Macdonald

P. O. Box 198

62 Lakeshore Drive

Belgrade Lakes, ME 04918

From: Thomas Llewellyn <tom@realcooperative.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Thomas Llewellyn

630 Flicker Ridge PO Box 146

Canyon, CA 94516

From: John Howieson <howiesoj@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John Howieson

11322 SW Riverwood Rd.

Portland, OR 97219

From: Robert Chirpin <gldlight@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Robert Chirpin

18520 Vincennes St

#59

Northridge, CA 91324

From: Jesse C. Young <jesseyoung1@mac.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jesse C. Young

501 Newberry St. SW

Aiken, SC 29801

From: Dan Schwartz <das18014@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 2:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over. The plan to move waste around doesn't make sense (except to increase the profits of some companies and move the liability around) and creates unacceptable new hazards.

Sincerely,

Dan Schwartz

2447 Yost Rd

Bath, PA 18014

From: mary alyce behrns <mabehrns@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

mary alyce behrns

5855 el camino dr.

5855 el camino dr.

englewood, CO 80111

From: Ken Fogel <kfogel7@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ken Fogel

338 Valley Lake Dr.

Stone Mtn., GA 30087

From: Peter Bianco <Pencil@riseup.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Peter Bianco

190 Clinton Road

New Hartford, NY 13413

From: Matthew Franck <cnjmatt@optonline.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Matthew Franck

119 Livingston Ave Apt 5G

119 Livingston Ave Apt 5G

New Brunswick, NJ 08901

From: Mary Cascio <marycascio@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mary Cascio

Portland, OR 97211

From: Elizabeth Erpelding-Garratt <erpeldinggarratt@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Erpelding-Garratt

666 W Ferry #23

Apt 23

Buffalo, NY 14222

From: Kaiba White <kaibawhite@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kaiba White

1307 Barton Hills Dr Apt 8

Austin, TX 78704

From: Judy Knueven <judyknueven@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Judy Knueven

131 Dehaven Rd

Beaver Falls, PA 15010

From: Brent Rocks <brent_rocks@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Brent Rocks

1518 SW Upper Hall st

Portland, OR 97201

From: evan hershenson <futurecantor@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

evan hershenson

45 tremlett street

45 Tremlett Street

dorchester, MA 02124

From: Ardelle Tuxen <atuxen@charter.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ardelle Tuxen

2133 29th St. S.

La Crosse, WI 54601

From: james mcgettigan <jpmcgett@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

james mcgettigan

2 south tallahassee avenue

atlantic city, NJ 08401

From: Ken Segal <knsegal@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ken Segal

58 Hilltop Acres

Yonkers, NY 10704

From: Elinor Yahm <ehyahm@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Elinor Yahm

1095 Bliss RD

East Montpelier, VT 05482

From: Jane Goebel <Birder665@optonline.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jane Goebel

142 Morley Circle, Melville ,NY 11747

Melville, NY 11747

From: Masahiro Omomo <nonica@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Masahiro Omomo

530 Frances Street

Ventura, CA 93003

From: Colonel Meyer <RonM430@AOL.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Colonel Meyer

3701 Eagle Pass Street

North Port, FL 34286

From: Al Abrams <alanabrams@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Al Abrams

828 Beech Avenue

Findlay, OH 45840

From: Ryan McIntyre <ryannmcintyre@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ryan McIntyre

655 West Irving Park Rd.

Chicago, IL 60613

From: Patricia Purcell <tpwrite@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patricia Purcell

5435Clark Rd

#44

Paradise, CA 95969

From: Sally Lambert <salam@volcano.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sally Lambert

PO Box 215

Sutter Creek, CA 95685

From: thomas hall <thomaschallmd@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

thomas hall

20 bowline court

20 bowline court

bellingham, WA 98229

From: Caroline Doenmez <doenmezc@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Caroline Doenmez

Dublin, NH 03444

From: dr. constance Buck <drbuck99@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

dr. constance Buck

21 ABANICO RD

SANTA FE, NM 87508

From: Alan Vovolka <alan.char@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Alan Vovolka

3719 Hamilton St

Omaha, NE 68131

From: T. Fernández <unitedwithall@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

T. Fernández

P O Box 7541

Burbank, CA 91510

From: Ann Follette <annfo@pitt.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

We have learned at Hanford that the casks are leaking. It is time to end this fiasco.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ann Follette

114 Stanton Ct W

114 Stanton Ct W

Pittsburgh, PA 15201

From: barbara harris <bharris21@nyc.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Nuclear waste is deadly and poses potential health issues for many. The recent severe and unusual weather conditions emphasize the need for secure and limited transfer of nuclear waste less the facilities be compromised. Above all, let's plan to 'transfer' nuclear power initiatives into renewable, green alternatives.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

barbara harris

24 Central Park South

24 Central Park South

New York, NY 10019

From: Joanne Dixon <jvdix@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joanne Dixon

216 Steven Dr

Colorado Springs, CO 80911

From: Shireen Parsons <pachamama3@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Our radioactive waste problem must be an utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate repeatedly moving deadly radioactive waste.

While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it must first be transferred only from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would only increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and, even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative, would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should be forced to accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I demand that you focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future, rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry, which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program.

The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. However, for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

You must scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Shireen Parsons

1365 Kennedy St. NW #508

Washington, DC 20011

From: Karen Kirschling <kumasong@excite.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Karen Kirschling

633 Oak Street

San Francisco, CA 94117

From: Nick Mantas <nickmantas@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nick Mantas

372 Wilson Avenue

Township of Washington, NJ 07676

From: Mike Diel <mikediel@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mike Diel

201A 7th St

Macon

Macon, MO 63552

From: Robert Linzmeier <musicman690@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Robert Linzmeier

950 E Wilmette Rd

Palatine, IL 60074

From: Norm Littlejohn <norm.littlejohn@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Norm Littlejohn

1230 Williamson St. #2

Madison, WI 53703

From: dinda evans <dindamcp4@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

dinda evans

pob 178695

san diego, CA 92117

From: Roxanne Warren <rwaa@erols.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I urge you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Roxanne Warren

523 West 112th Street #72

523 West 112th Street

New York, NY 10025

From: Ian Carlon <order_disorder@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ian Carlon

San Jose, CA 95116

From: m s <mschopac@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

m s

20 Indian Trail

Charlestown, RI 02813

From: Mark Torrel <lima@q.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mark Torrel

10667 West Evans Creek Rd

10667 west evans creek rd, rogue river, or

Rogue River, OR 97537

From: Laura Stewart <yogini850@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Laura Stewart

157 Maestas Road

Ranchos de Taos, NM 87557

From: Virginia H. Bennett <vbennett@hawaii.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Virginia H. Bennett

1201 Wilder Ave. #1704

#1704

Honolulu, HI 96822

From: Pat Blackwel <BlackwellPatR@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Pat Blackwel

4311 Cove Loop Road

Hendersonville, NC 28739

From: Robert Blackwell <BlackwellWR@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Robert Blackwell

4311 Cove Loop Rd

Hendersonville, NC 28739

From: Agoya Killeen <rawlove@att.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Agoya Killeen

103 eucalyptus ave

Santa Cruz, CA 95060

From: Sherry Pollack <davidsher@juno.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sherry Pollack

47-185-A Hui Akepa Place

47-185 A Hui Akepa Place

Kaneohe, HI 96744

From: MichaelEric Lerner <bklerner@pobox.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

MichaelEric Lerner

1671 Marina Way

1671 Marina Way

San Jose, CA 95125

From: Tess Reiss <contessa_milw@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

S.O.P. - Save Our Planet!

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Tess Reiss

3340 s pennsylvania

Milwaukee, WI 53207

From: Ron McGill <underconsume@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ron McGill

35 Maywood

Irvine, CA 92602

From: Ron McGill <underconsume@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ron McGill

35 Maywood

Irvine, CA 92602

From: Thomas V. Connor <TConnor@hvc.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Thomas V. Connor

17 Dubois Street

17 Dubois Street

Wallkill, NY 12589

From: B. Lerner <bklerner@pobox.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

B. Lerner

1671 Marina Way

1671 Marina Way

San Jose, CA 95125

From: Matthew Cleveland <dolphin@newmenu.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Matthew Cleveland

71 Westminster Dr

Elizabethtown, PA 17022

From: Peter Sigmann <peter@sigmann.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Peter Sigmann

3732 Rocky Shore dr

none

Sturgeon Bay, WI 54235

From: Vic and Barby Ulmer <odw@magiclink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, would create more, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

PLEASE focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

PLEASE scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Vic and Barby Ulmer

13004 Paseo Presada

13004 Paseo Presada

Saratoga, CA 95070

From: mark lopes <lopes_mark@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

mark lopes

16 clark ave

rutherford, NJ 07070

From: A.J. Averett <AJAverett@outlook.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Addressing the long-standing issue of radioactive waste must be of the utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is completely broken -- and has been for more than half a century, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the still-growing problems, worsening the already substantial threat.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would fix NOTHING; it is totally unacceptable. No sane individual charged with the protection of public health, safety and security could mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. Though the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft -- and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative -- would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community would -- or should -- accept such an outcome, yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

You MUST focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the long-range future, rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry -- which would be the only beneficiary of such an absurd program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Your "discussion draft" must be abandoned, and your approach completely reworked. The clock continues to run.

Very truly yours,

A.J. Averett

5099 Mesa Terrace

La Mesa, CA 91941

From: M Eloise Adams <mea347@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

M Eloise Adams

3 Pooks Hill Road

Apt 902

Bethesda, MD 20814

From: Suleyman Doenmez <suleysoccer@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Suleyman Doenmez

Dublin, NH 03444

From: Jessica Fondy <j_fondy@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jessica Fondy

1835 Arlington Ave

Pittsburgh, PA 15210

From: Liz Helenchild <deejayliz@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Liz Helenchild

Box 1276

Mendocino, CA 95460

From: Denise Manzari <dpmanzari@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Denise Manzari

Amity Road

Bethany, CT 06524

From: Roderick Jude <rjjude@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Roderick Jude

48065 Gallatin Rd

Gallatin Gateway, MT 59730

From: Kazuye Suyematsu <kazuye@lmi.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kazuze Suyematsu

1483 San Pablo Ave.

1483 San Pablo Ave., Berkeley, CA 94702

Berkeley, CA 94702

From: Keli Myers <Keli.myers12@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Keli Myers

5386 hwy 5

Catawba, SC 29704

From: nora pearl <noraleepearl@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

nora pearl

19 eighth street

petaluma, CA 94952

From: Margaret Wright <mzwright@att.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Margaret Wright

162 Brevoort Rd

162 Brevoort Rd., Columbus 43214

Columbus, OH 43214

From: Alex Snyderman <alexsnymdman@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Alex Snyderman

24545 Town Center Drive

Unit 5309

Valencia, CA 91355

From: Barbara Oneal <barbaraoneal@embarqmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Barbara Oneal

173 Roy Duncan Lane

173 Roy Duncan Lane

Erwin, TN 37650

From: Theodore Volle <edted226@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Theodore Volle

15097 Olympic Dr. #226

Clearlake, CA 95422

From: B. M. <bmgatto1@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

B. M.

800 Greenwood Ave

Brooklyn, NY 11218

From: Keith Eagle <deradler43@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Keith Eagle

3817 Devonshire Dr

3817 Devonshire Dr.

Salisbury, MD 21804

From: Marilyn Ortt <marilynortt@suddenlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Ortt

701 Colegate Drive

701 Colegate Dr.

Marietta, OH 45750

From: Maya Tracy Borhani <gmcmaya@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Maya Tracy Borhani

2268 W. 37th ave

vancouver, BC V6M 1P1

From: James Provenzano <jjpro@roadrunner.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

James Provenzano

3438 Merrimac Road

Los Angeles, CA 90049

From: Craig Fiels <craigfiels@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:16 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Craig Fiels

4605 Park blvd

O, CA 94602

From: Patrick Dreier <patrick.dreier@gmx.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources, priority renewables energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patrick Dreier

Industrie 10

Industrie 10, ot 2114

From: Alice Granahan <windmillpat@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:14 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Alice Granahan

51 Croyden Rd.

Hingham, MA 02043

From: cassandra church <sparrowcat2@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

cassandra church

1853 county rd.

1853 country rd.

e. montpelier, VT 05601

From: Alice Granahan <windmillpat@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Alice Granahan

51 Croyden Rd.

Hingham, MA 02043

From: dave falcon <entrepreneur1@hotmail.co.uk>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:13 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

dave falcon

26 windsor terr

penicuik, NY 12345

From: Gwen Lambert <yardarice33@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gwen Lambert

Dayton, OH 45440

From: jeannie pollak <jeannie22ster@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

jeannie pollak

Honeysuckle drive

oxnard, CA 93036

From: Ruth Busch <betzy@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ruth Busch

6079 County Road 290

6077 County Road 290

Lafayette, AL 36862

From: Patrick Dreier <patrick.dreier@gmx.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:12 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patrick Dreier

Industrie 10

Industrie 10, ot 2114

From: Gene and Dori Peters <petersgene@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

Please focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Thank you.

Peace!

Gene and Dori Peters

204 W. Havens, # 150

Mitchell, SD 57301

From: Julie Ann Wang <jawang1@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Julie Ann Wang

1200 Chesterfield

1200 Chesterfield

Birmingham, MI 48009

From: Judiann Edwards-Burrus <judiann@centurytel.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Judiann Edwards-Burrus

HC 3 Box 561

Gainesville, MO 65655

From: P Galbavy <pash@faceuptopeace.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

I support and endorse the following letter and hope you will too:

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

P Galbavy

45 Siesta Lane

Sedona, AZ 86351

From: Miles Perry <miles_m_perry@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Miles Perry

11806 N. mountain Laurel Pl.

11806 N. Mtn. Laurel Pl. Oro Valley Az, 85737

Oro Valley, AZ 85737

From: Mark Hayduke Grenard <grenardmarkhayduke@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mark Hayduke Grenard

12810 N. Cave Creek Rd. #105

Phoenix, Yuck, Sprawl, AZ 85022

From: John Richkus <johnrichkus@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:10 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John Richkus

206 Congress Street

Jersey City, NJ 07307

From: probyn gregory <probyngregory@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

probyn gregory

10877 Deliban St

10877 deliban st

los angeles, CA 91042

From: Terry Ermini <savitriermini@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:09 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Terry Ermini

2330 Hurley Way

2443 Fair Oaks Blvd., #206

Sacramento, CA 95825

From: Barbara Antonoplos <superwoman50@bellsouth.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:08 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Barbara Antonoplos

369 Bass St., S.E.

369 Bass St., S.E., Atlanta, GA 30315

Atlanta, GA 30315

From: Tom Ferguson <tf@thinkspeak.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Tom Ferguson

372 Oakland Ave SE

Atlanta, GA 30312

From: Courtney Watson <courtneywat@juno.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:06 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Courtney Watson

515 Poppy Ave #B

515 Poppy Ave #B

Corona del Mar, CA 92625

From: Sarah Doenmez <sdoenmez@dublinschool.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sarah Doenmez

18 Lehmann Way

Dublin, NH 03444

From: Dorothy Lebovitz <dantzwthme@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:05 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Lebovitz

1767 Seth Loop E

Upland, CA 91784

From: Ed Fiedler <sparkplug2525@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:04 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ed Fiedler

12325 Limerick Ave

Austin, TX 78758

From: Karin Nelson-Rogers <kmna1@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Karin Nelson-Rogers

10000 S. Damen Avenue

Chicago, IL 60643

From: John Schaechter <jschaechter@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John Schaechter

42 will dr. #52

Canton, MA 02021

From: Phyl Morello <1432Phyl@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Phyl Morello

984 Harrison Ferry

984 Harrison Ferry

White Pine, TN 37890

From: Grant Smith <gssmith5123@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

If we were smart, we'd start discussing how best to transition away from nuclear power before the next catastrophic accident occurs, which could easily happen here in the US, particularly given the shoddy maintenance record of the industry. How many more debacles and boondoggles will we have to suffer at the hands of this industry before we learn?

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Grant Smith

5123 Carrollton Ave

Indianapolis, IN 46205

From: nancy Forrest <ravenforrest@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:03 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

nancy Forrest

PO Box31

2234 F Basil Holt Road

Haw River, NC 27258

From: Cletus Stein <cletus@arn.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Why have a military, if we're not protecting our country from long-lasting, dangerous materials? Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Cletus Stein

5113 SW `16th

5113 sw16th

amarillo, TX 79106

From: Edie Montague <emon050@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:02 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Edie Montague

620 Sonoma Valley Ct #11

Crestview Hills, KY 41017

From: Sharon Goldstein <sharongoldstein123@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sharon Goldstein

71 E 4th St # 4B, ny,ny 10003

New York, NY 10003

From: Diana Bunin <dbf331@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:01 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Diana Bunin

19562 Windward Lane

Huntington Beach, CA 92646

From: Angie Bray <angie@angiebray.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Angie Bray

1040 victoria avenue venice ca 90291

Venice, CA 90291

From: Steve Bartholomew <barticle@chargedbarticle.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Steve Bartholomew

10 Royale Ave Apt 33

Lakeport, CA 95453

From: darynne jessler <darynnej@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

darynne jessler

4408 gentry ave

NA

valley village, CA 91607

From: Curt Sommer <curt.sommer@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Curt Sommer

18490 Lower Midhill Dr.

18490 Lower Midhill Dr.

West Linn, OR 97068

From: ellen goodman <egoodman1942@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

ellen goodman

117 Warren Ave., Apt.1

East Providence, RI 02914

From: Robert H. Wilcox <bobwilcox@uwalumni.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:00 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Robert H. Wilcox

6915 Amherst Ave

Saint Louis, MO 63130

From: trina cooper <trina.cooper@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

trina cooper

2239 sw 331st st

2239 sw 331st st

federal way, WA 98023

From: mike lyons <mjlyons321@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

mike lyons

172 woodbridge ave

sewaren, NJ 07077

From: Wendy Heald <wpheald@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Wendy Heald

PO Box 4612

Sedon, AZ 86336

From: Martine Saura <odilesaura@hotmail.fr>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Martine Saura

St-Gabriel-de-Brandon, QC J0K2N0

From: Ellen Mulkerin <ellmulk@optonline.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ellen Mulkerin

483 ocean parkway #6D

483 ocean parkway #6D

brooklyn, NY 11218

From: Sheila Gholson <sheilagholsen@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sheila Gholson

2271 Dartmouth

Palo Alto, CA 94306

From: Mindy Simmons <thechirp@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

Actually the insanity of it all is that we continue to operate nuclear business that produces such toxic waste to begin with. We should in fact be doing away with all Nuclear energy projects! Why does mankind continue to suppose that we are able to keep up business as usual when we are putting future generations entirely at risk?

And so I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mindy Simmons

5287 box turtle circle

5287 Box Turtle Circle

Sarasota, FL 34232

From: Scott Bishop <sbishop@oly-wa.us>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Scott Bishop

1710 Giles NW

1710 Giles NW

Olympia, WA 98502

From: Ryan Navickas <westmedfordfarmteam@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ryan Navickas

2970 Madrona Lane

madrona lane, medford

Medford, OR 97501

From: Marilyn Mechtenberg <mmechtenberg@ihmsisters.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marilynn A. Mechtenberg, I.H.M.

Marilynn Mechtenberg

610 West Elm Ave.

Monroe, MI 48162

From: Hongying Hu <gooten@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Hongying Hu

3214 Bowser Ave.

3214 Bowser Ave.

Fort Wayne, IN 46806

From: Kevin Parks <doctorparks@optonline.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kevin Parks

823 Trenton Avenue

823 Trenton Avenue

POINT PLEASANT, NJ 08742

From: Miguel Ramos <mantecax@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:58 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Miguel Ramos

4663 fremont st

Bellingham, WA 98229

From: Yasiu Kruszynski <kruszynski.j@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Yasiu Kruszynski

1100 W Addison St

Chicago, IL 60613

From: Sylvan Grey <lenrivers@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sylvan Grey

4826 SE 76th Ave

Portland, OR 97206

From: Phil Lusk <plusk@pipeline.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Phil Lusk

404 S Washington Street

82 Westwind Drive

Port Angeles, WA 98362

From: Karen Miller <krisepoo@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Karen Miller

129 Martha Dr

Corpus Christi, TX 78418

From: Garland Cole <garland.cole@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:56 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Garland Cole

457 W. 28th St.

1FL

chicago, IL 60616

From: al krause <akguiness@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

al krause

19 pomander walk

nyc, NY 10025

From: j davis <76photos@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

j davis

chattanooga, TN 37405

From: John Templeton <johnboy11@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John Templeton

20 Tamarack Dr.

Amherst, MA 01002

From: Ruth Agius <latifa.agius@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

GO SLAR STOP PRODUCING THIS POSON IN THE FIRST PLACE! STOP MINING NEW MATERIALS!!!

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ruth Agius

Santa Fe, NM 87501

From: Jan Tache <tache@together.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:55 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems. IT WOULD NOT BE A SOLUTION!

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. MY FAMILY DOESN'T WANT IT MOVING THROUGH OUR NEIGHBORHOOD. NO ONE IN CONGRESS WOULD WANT IT MOVING THROUGH THEIR NEIGHBORHOODS. SO WHAT POOR SOULS DO WE MAKE THIS HAPPEN TO??

While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation.

A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

MY FAMILY BEGS YOU TO FOCUS ON OUR HEALTH, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND EQUITY FOR THE FUTURE---AND NOT THE INTERESTS OF THE NUCLEAR POWER INDUSTRY! PLEASE!! THEY WOULD BE THE ONLY BENEFICIARY OF SUCH A PROGRAM.

The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

PLEASE START OVER WITH THE "DISCUSSION DRAFT."

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jan Tache

PO Box 1210

Penn Valley, CA 95946

From: Louis Avrami <avramil@concentric.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Louis Avrami

4 Paula Court

Morristown, NJ 07960

From: Carleen Greenman <carleengreenman@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:54 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carleen Greenman

10978 Rocky Road

10978 Rocky Road

Bent Mountain, VA 24059

From: Vic Anderson <sixt2ndpatriot@hushmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" (It's NUKING FUT\$!) and start over.

Sincerely,

Vic Anderson

1999 Bradbury Road

OK

Eagle Lake, FL 33880

From: Sheila Spencer <Sheraspencer@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:53 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sheila Spencer

2212 SW 4th St

Gresham, OR 97080

From: Susan Rowe <srowe@sti.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Susan Rowe

28481 Copper Creek Drive

28481 Copper Creek Drive

Coarsegold, CA 93614

From: Ruth Butler <blueetre@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ruth Butler

1872 s 200 e

slc, UT 84115

From: Joy Ruehl <ruehlj3@nku.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joy Ruehl

PO Box 633

Milford, OH 45103

From: Nancy Baer <redrockclass@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nancy Baer

Sedona, AZ 86336

From: Irwin and Martha Spiegelman <spieg52@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Irwin and Martha Spiegelman

185 Middle St

Amherst, MA 01002

From: Bill & Marilyn Voorhies <lynny04@roadrunner.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bill & Marilyn Voorhies

38 Clark Point Rd.

PO Box 231

West Tremont, ME 04612

From: Michele French <inb0x@lavabit.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michele French

3612 SE Morrison St.

Portland, OR 97214

From: Susan Sontag <sontag@swbell.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Susan Sontag

Saint Louis, MO 63130

From: Doyle Stadt <dsharbor-env@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over. God forbid your support of this legislation should someday lead to a nuclear waste spill disaster in a train derailment or crash on a highway.

Sincerely,

Doyle Stadt

905 N Duchesne

905 N Duchesne Dr St. Charles, MO

Saint Charles, MO 63301

From: Merrill Franco <mwof2@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Merrill Franco

6054 N Kavanagh

Fresno, CA 93711

From: Matthew Bennett <greenmachine75@optonline.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:50 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Matthew Bennett

20 Kirkwood Rd

Port Washington, NY 11050

From: KATHLEENm MARTINEZ <kmartinez000@centurytel.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

This is not a tornado- YOU CAN PREVENT THIS PROBLEM FROM HITTING.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

KATHLEENm MARTINEZ

4204 FOURWINDS DR

4204 FOURWINDS DR

COLUMBIA, MO 65202

From: frank downey <zakk69@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

frank downey

800 covan ave

mobile, AL 36612

From: Ross Randrup <rossasaurus@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ross Randrup

po box 851

POB 851

Sebastopol, CA 95473

From: Chris O'Connor <cjo30080@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:48 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Chris O'Connor

2197 Berryhill Circle

2197 Berryhill Circle

Smyrna, GA 30082

From: Larry Siegel <lrrysgl@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:47 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Larry Siegel

2113 Fox Run Drive

2113 Fox Run Drive

Plainsboro, NJ 08536

From: Robert O'Brien <robrien2000@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:46 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Robert O'Brien

972 Allamanda DR.

Delray Beach, FL 33483

From: sally frances mann <sfrances1@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

sally frances mann

180 DeGraw St.

brooklyn, NY 11231

From: John Steponaitis <steponaj@takas.lt>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John Steponaitis

910 Geary 20

San Francisco, CA 94109

From: Lee Sturdivant <naturals@rockisland.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lee Sturdivant

745 Larsen St.

Friday Harbor, WA 98250

From: kerry burkhardt <muddydog69@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

kerry burkhardt

182 ferndale avenue

apt. e

kenmore, NY 14217

From: Patt Doyle <patt@olyphen.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patt Doyle

PO BOX 93

Heisson, WA 98622

From: Sylvia Schleimer <yaharah@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Schleimer

1777 N. Allen Ave

1777 N. Allen Ave

Pasadena, CA 91104

From: Carol Van Strum <cvs@casco.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Perpetuating a problem does NOT solve it. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carol Van Strum

7493 E Five Rivers

Tidewater, OR 97390

From: James Moffat <jmoffat64@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

James Moffat

52 B Lasatta Ave.

Englishtown, NJ 07726

From: Anita Buffer <mybuff.net@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive WASTE PROBLEM.

It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably BROKEN, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only 'exacerbate' the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply UNACCEPTABLE. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement MUST BE only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would SERVE ONLY TO DELAY permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the NARROW INTERESTS of the NUCLEAR POWER

INDUSTRY--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program.

The BEST WAY to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to PHASE OUT the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Anita Buffer

Winding Way

Winding Way

Warminster, PA 18974

From: Christel Etter <milogt@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:44 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Christel Etter

1712 Susan Stone Dr.

Urbana, IL 61802

From: Anthony Hall <ahtopanga@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Anthony Hall

101 S. Topanga Cyn. Blvd., #113

Topanga, CA 90290

From: Ann Rogers <arog13@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ann Rogers

3601 Hickory Ave.

Baltimore, MD 21211

From: Joe Cross <pizzajoevt@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joe Cross

Po box 132

Po box 132

Calais, VT 05648

From: Linda Brebner <lbbreb@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Linda Brebner

254 Highland Parkway

Rochester, NY 14620

From: Devin Henry <mrdsir@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Devin Henry

PO Box 413

Nichols, NY 13812

From: Timothy O'Connell <oconnell108@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Timothy O'Connell

415 Sherrow Avenue

Falls Church, VA 22046

From: Devin Henry <mrdsir@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Devin Henry

PO Box 413

Nichols, NY 13812

From: aron shevis <ashevis@nygoexpress.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

aron shevis

302 windsor pl

brooklyn, NY 11218

From: Michael Brackney <brackney@nccn.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michael Brackney

San Diego, CA 92103

From: valerie gilbert <weareallone@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

valerie gilbert

no snail mail

new york, NY 10022

From: maxine priest <agehapriest@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

maxine priest

2618 mlk blvd

new orleans, LA 70113

From: Patricia Baley <patricia.mcrae@unlv.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patricia Baley

4150 E. Pinecrest Circle

Las Vegas, NV 89121

From: Jan McCall <jan71mccall@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jan McCall

278 Vine St.

West Bend, WI 53095

From: ron johnson <solardrumzz@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

ron johnson

4624 kelby

omaha, NE 68152

From: Marilyn Borges <mb8486@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Borges

8486 Cam. Estrellado

San Diego, CA 92120

From: DEBRA LENZ <debbylenz@energybalancing.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

DEBRA LENZ

142 Boyd Way

142 boyd way

carmel, CA 93923

From: Christina Imhoof <cimhoof@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Christina Imhoof

6271 Lakewood Street

San Diego, CA 92122

San Diego, CA 92122

From: Sandra Woodall <lswoodall@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sandra Woodall

118 Hermine Blvd.

San Antonio, TX 78212

From: Maryann LaNew <melanew@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:40 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable!

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over. Thank you in advance for doing the best thing for all of us now!

Sincerely,

Maryann LaNew

12 Corte Loarre

San Clemente

CA 92673-6520, CA 92673

From: Carolyn Lilly <clilly@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Lilly

6114 Cam. Sacate

San Diego, CA 92120

From: Bob Higgins <rlh974@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bob Higgins

2749 Ferncliff Ave

Dayton, OH 45420

From: JOLIE DE PAUW <JOLIE@LOTUSDOG.NET>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

JOLIE DE PAUW

PO Box 6756

SAN RAFAEL, CA 94903

From: Drew Martin <DMandCH@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Drew Martin

500 Lake Ave. #102

Lake Worth, FL 33460

From: stephanie dryden <8unity8@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

stephanie dryden

203 high st

Ashland, OR 97520

From: SF Fleming <Susaflem@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

SF Fleming

PO Box 58858

PO Box 58858

SLC, UT 84108

From: William E. Woodcock <nospam@woodynet.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

William E. Woodcock

2355 Virginia Street

Berkeley, CA 94709

From: Fr. Jim Hoffman OFM <jimofmhoffman@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:39 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Fr. Jim Hoffman OFM

110 W. Madison St

Chicago, IL 60602

From: Jeanine Ertl <jjertl@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jeanine Ertl

11000 briceland rd.

11000 Briceland Road

Whitethorn, CA 95589

From: Arlene Williamson <a.williamson99@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:38 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Arlene Williamson

103 Surf Drive, Mashpee MA 02649

Mashpee, MA 02649

From: Peter Gunther <avengethecathars@juno.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Peter Gunther

2318 W. Sunnyside #3

Chicago, IL 60625

From: Mary Ann Skweres <mas4reel@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Skweres

7659 Sand Canyon Road

7659 Sand Canyon Road

Wrightwood, CA 92397

From: Daniel STICKNEY <daniel.stickney@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Daniel STICKNEY

933 E Moorhead Cir

Boulder, CO 80305

From: James Shawvan <jshawvan@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

James Shawvan

2260 El Cajon Blvd. # 890

San Diego, CA 91945

From: Elizabeth Case <bcase@bcasesite.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Case

10 Otis Place #5

Boston, MA 02108

From: Betty Tagge <batfat@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Betty Tagge

22 S Ogden St #224

7200 E Quincy Ave #109

Denver, CO 80209

From: Catherine Lee <leecatheri@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable. I support HOSS

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority.

I live 2 miles from I10 in San Antonio TX, and think this highly radioactive waste would traverse this interstate from nuclear power plants further east, headed toward the ill-conceived repository in the Texas panhandle. Thus I feel personally jeopardized, along the millions of other residents of this city.

The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly.

I support HOSS, that is storing Irradiated fuel as safely as possible as close to the site of generation as possible. Waste moved from fuel pools must be

safeguarded in hardened, on-site storage (HOSS) facilities. HOSS facilities

must not be regarded as a permanent waste solution, and thus should not be constructed deep

underground. The waste must be retrievable, and real-time radiation and heat monitoring at

the HOSS facility must be implemented for early detection of radiation releases and

overheating. The overall objective of HOSS should be that the amount of releases projected

in even severe attacks should be low enough that the storage system would be unattractive as

a terrorist target.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Catherine Lee

138 North Dr

San Antonio, TX 78201

From: Lawrence Crowley <magic@ecentral.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Crowley

441 Pheasant Run

Louisville, CO 80027

From: Marie Driscoll <omamarie53@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:36 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Marie Driscoll

400 SW Marion Lane

Lee's Summit, MO 64081

From: Dennis Lane <nitrox3@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dennis Lane

140 Wagon Wheel Lane

140 Wagon Wheel Ln.

Cutchogue, NY 11935

From: Theresa Baldwin <Ravenwoman1@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Theresa Baldwin

1 corral ln. # 69

Ashland, OR 97520

From: Margie Borchers <margieborchers@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Margie Borchers

401 e micheltorena st

Apt. #2

santa barbara, CA 93101

From: Carol Langford <drclangfo@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:35 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Carol Langford

box 2895

72 Goosepoint lane

Duxbury, MA 02331

From: Elena Michaelson <elenamichaelson@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Elena Michaelson

4611 Richmond Ave.

6507 Krollton Dr.

Austin, TX 78745

From: Charlie Williams <lirico1@netscape.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:34 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Charlie Williams

1178 Birdie Lane

Holland, MI 49423

From: Nicole Sauber <nikkisauber@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nicole Sauber

Keene, NH 03431

From: Cheryl Richard <cr111@outlook.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Interim storage of high-level radioactive waste is unacceptable. It's unacceptable to have mobile rad-waste storage on our roads and rails. These options you're exploring are extremely dangerous. Cheap and easy, quick money, quick solutions, are the death of this country. Why are Americans so bone-headed? Is it the psychiatric drugs? The fluoridated water? The chemtrails? The general prevalence of psychopathy in a country engaged in dozens of wars around the globe at all times? You're destroying the country and the world in pursuit of profit, you jerks.

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Richard

940 San Jose Ave No 4``

SF, CA 94110

From: Chris Wall <thegreatwall_6@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:33 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Chris Wall

815 S. Davis

815 S. Davis

Kirksville, MO 63501

From: Jim Bell <jimbellels@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jim Bell

4862 Voltaire St.

4862 Voltaire St.

San Diego, CA 92107

From: John Blair <ecoserve@valleywatch.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John Blair

800 Adams Ave.

Evansville, IN 47713

From: Abe Levy <abe@slought.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:(SENDER VALIDATION FAILED --- May not have originated from apparent sender) Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Abe Levy

4875 Pelican Colony Boulevard #301

Bonita Springs, FL 34134

From: Barbara Ryland <barbara.ryland@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:32 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Barbara Ryland

69 Kaler Road

69 Kaler Road

South Portland, ME 04106

From: Louis Cox <louis@peaceforearth.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Louis Cox

360 Toad Rd.

Charlotte, VT 05445

From: Rose Penelope Yee <rose@greenretirementplans.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Rose Penelope Yee

8080 Capwell Drive, Suite 202

Oakland, CA 94621

From: Douglas McNeill <doug.mcneill@wap.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Douglas McNeill

33 Ridge Rd, Unit T

unit T

Greenbelt, MD 20770

From: Heather Kirk <halmakirk@yahoo.co.uk>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Heather Kirk

Ruifour

Inveness, ot IV4 7HT

From: Gail Lack <rgkk4@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:31 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Gail Lack

1417 Shawnee Way

Salinas, CA 93906

From: Hartson Doak <hartson.doak@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Hartson Doak

96226 Waiawa Rd #43

96266 Waiawa Rd #43

Pearl City, HI 96782

From: Robert Ross <robertrossband@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you but not in my community. And my community is the whole planet. Why? Because once radiation is released it travels everywhere by the action of the wind and waters.

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Robert Ross

239 Finley Ave

Staten Island, NY 10306

From: Ruth Lanton <ruth811@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ruth Lanton

15 Mitchell Ave Plainview NY 11803

Plainview, NY 11803

From: Richard Wallace <rswallace@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Richard Wallace

1015 SE Miller st

Portland, OR 97202

From: maars@EPassageNet.com

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

CA 92651

From: David Schachne <d.schachne@ahcvets.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:30 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Schachne

278 Clinton Avenue

Albany, NY 12210

From: Ruth Wales <ruth4njb@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ruth Wales

255 W. 23rd Street

255 west 23rd street

New York, NY 10011

From: linda gibson <gibsonlm@bellsouth.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

linda gibson

1515 lake drive

1515 lake dr

delray beach, FL 33444

From: dwight stickler <dwight.stickler@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

dwight stickler

7493 Oregon Trail

boardman, OH 44512

From: Glenda Bailey-Mershon <tsipa@me.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly and would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Glenda Bailey-Mershon

St. Augustine, FL 32086

From: juliana van arsdale <jvanarsdale@att.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

juliana van arsdale

PO box 356

Monessen, AL 15062

From: John Wetherhold <zixu@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:29 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

The transport of massive quantities of radioactive wastes through our public roads and rails is nuts. Only hardened on site storage will keep this stuff safe. We dont want rolling Fukashimas on our highways.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

John Wetherhold

13 W. 13th St #4BS

13 w. 13th st.

New York, NY 10011

From: Christian Sweningsen <csweningsen@berk.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Christian Sweningsen

18 Riverview St

18 Riverview St

Stuyvesant, NY 12173

From: Linda Foglia McFadden <lindamcfadden4@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:28 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Linda Foglia McFadden

3051 Navajo Court

Gibsonia, PA 15044

From: rebecca tippens <rebecca_tippens@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

rebecca tippens

68 Van Nuys Rd

68 Van Nuys rd

Colrain, MA 01340

From: Joe Mestas <jomestas@centurytel.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joe Mestas

so 7th

Manassa, CO 81141

From: Linda Jones <catslady3@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Linda Jones

1349 Hollowell St

Ontario, CA 91762

From: Denis DellaLoggia <DenisDL@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Denis DellaLoggia

416 Milmar Road

Wilmington, DE 19804

From: Stephen Ekholm <ekholm33@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Stephen Ekholm

6290 Eagle Harbor Dr. NE

6290 Eagle Harbor Dr. NE, Bainbridge Island WA 98110

Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

From: Barry Swedlow <bubbawitz@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:27 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Barry Swedlow

Lynchburg, VA 24501

From: Scott Nelson <play@kiteisland.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Scott Nelson

POB 1075

Bethel Island, CA 94511

From: Steve Lett <stevelett@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Steve Lett

600A W. Blithedale Ave.

600A W. Blithedale Ave

Mill Valley, CA 94941

From: Wanda Remington <wtremington@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Wanda Remington

815 East E St.,

Brunswick, MD 21716

From: Brian Ainsley <Brian.Ainsley@centurylink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Brian Ainsley

1024 Strachan Drive

Fort Collins, CO 80525

From: Toby Klein <tobyk03@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Toby Klein

325 Thorne Road

Sullivan, ME 04664

From: Beth Russo <bstmartin51@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Beth Russo

15690 NE 95th Way

Redmond, WA 98052

From: j angell <jangell@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

j angell

Ponderosa Rd

rescue, CA 95672

From: David Burkhart <merlinbirdhawk@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Burkhart

Sunnyside Road

none

Salem, OR 97306

From: Nancy Hiestand <nancya0624@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

I don't believe there is any "safe" way to store radioactive waste.

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nancy Hiestand

526 South Campus Way, Davis

Davis

Davis, CA 95616

From: Jeanne Raymond <raymondj@peak.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:25 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

No one wants unsafe nuclear wastes stored "temporarily" in their back yard. This seems only to put the hard decisions off, while transporting, storing if moved again, just doubles the dangers.

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Raymond

3430 NW Elmwood Dr

3430 NW Elmwood Dr

Corvallis, OR 97330

From: Albert Bechtel <bigjbechtel4711@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security

should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Albert Bechtel

4131 11th Ave NE Apt 109

apt.109

Seattle, WA 98105

From: Christine Daum <info@oasismontana.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry

containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Christine Daum

436 Red Fox Lane

436 Red Fox Lane

Stevensville, MT 59870

From: Vicki Floray <vickiwhoapony@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinsein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Vicki Floray

5018 Old 40

Odessa, MO 64076

From: Iris Gallagher <paradigm.shift.key@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Iris Gallagher

93 Elm Street

Kingston, MA 02364

From: Harry and Kathy Brownfield <hbrown6905@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:24 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Harry and Kathy Brownfield

74 Acker Road

Newport, PA 17074

From: B. O'Connor <bonjourm@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the Narrow Interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a Thoughtless Program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to Phase Out the use of nuclear power and Replace it with Clean Energy Sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is Imperative!

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

B. O'Connor

P. O. Box 22262

P. O. Box 22262

Santa Fe,, NM 87502

From: Deke Gliem <gliemdm@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Deke Gliem

14286 141st Street

14286 141st Street

Dawson, IA 50066

From: Lisa Breslauer <lhbreslauer@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lisa Breslauer

San Jose, CA 95117

From: Michael Costello <mcostello@marincatholic.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michael Costello

300 Ridge Rd.

Novato, CA 94947

From: Paul O'Byrne <paulobyrne@ymail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Paul O'Byrne

12406 Kelly Place

Thonotosassa, FL 33592

From: Amber Joy <amberjoymd@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for looking into this because we just do not know enough to use this and store it safely. It is too expensive to built & takes too long. We need CLEAN, SAFE energy.

Again, thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Amber Joy

1005 Terrace St # 1105

1005 Terrace St

Seattle, WA 98104

From: David Gerke <dggerke@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:23 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Gerke

880 White Oaks Rd.

White Oaks, NM 88301

From: Judith Smith <axisdance@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Judith Smith

2712 Grande Vista Ave

Oakland, CA 94601

From: Beth Henry <bethhenry@carolina.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Beth Henry

3066 Stoneybrook Road

3066 Stoneybrook Road

Charlotte, NC 28205

From: Nathan Vogel <doctorspook@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nathan Vogel

49 alpine terrace

San Francisco, CA 94117

From: V Alexander <la_arcoiris_de_verdad@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

V Alexander

3504 Tulane Dr NE

Albuquerque, NM 87107

From: Ben Ruwe <benruwe@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Ben Ruwe

10272 Lomita Ave.

Felton, CA 95018

From: Christopher Norcross <christopnorcross@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Christopher Norcross

18 Shore Drive

Harwich, MA 02645

From: Tom Jackson <scrimm@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Tom Jackson

1124 S King St.

Denver, CO 80219

From: Donna Blue <donnablue@insightbb.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Donna Blue

117 N. Hanover Avenue

Lexington, KY 40502

From: Paige Harrison, R.N., BSN, OCN <Namastepj@me.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:22 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Paige Harrison, R.N., BSN, OCN

215 W 90 St

New York, NY 10024

From: Thomas Welton <welton01@care2.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Thomas Welton

202 Marshall St.

Brookneal, VA 24528

From: Pamela Raup-Kounovsky <pamelot3@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Pamela Raup-Kounovsky

37 High Street

Chatham, NY 12037

From: Raymond Nuesch <renuesch@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Rad waste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Raymond Nuesch

2000 16th Street NW

2000 16th Street NW

Washington, DC 20009

From: David Blot <david.blot@bcc.cuny.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

David Blot

5700 Arlington Avenue

Apt. 22X

Bronx, NY 10471

From: Roger Lippman <terrasol@igc.org>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:21 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Roger Lippman

710 Lake Washington Blvd South

Seattle, WA 98144

From: Mary R. Wolfe <omwolfmar@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Mary R. Wolfe

2 Oakridge Court

Lutherville, MD 21093

From: Bron Lucas <bronlucas@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Bron Lucas

205 1st Avenue E

205 1st Ave. E.

Halstad, MN 56548

From: roberto johnson <i_serve_you@netzero.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

roberto johnson

capitol heights

capitol heights, MD 20743

From: Larry Bulling <larry.bulling@oregonstate.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Larry Bulling

2321 NW Mulkey Ave.

n/a

Corvallis, OR 97330

From: Leslie Cassidy <leslie_cassidy@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to

delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Leslie Cassidy

534 East 83rd Street

Apartment 2B

New York, NY 10028

From: Kay Hawklee <Khawklee@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Kay Hawklee

1739 Fremont County Rd 21A

1739 Fremont County Rd 21A

Canon City, CO 81212

From: Linda Salamon <calligraphic@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Linda Salamon

18 Shore Drive

North Harwich, MA 02645

From: William, Margaret & Scott Holcomb <doslobos@charter.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

William, Margaret & Scott Holcomb

190 HAWKS' HAUNT LN

TRYON, NC 28782

From: Daniel Woods <Dan190270@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Daniel Woods

10742 S. Komensky Ave.

Oak Lawn, IL 60453

From: Karl Koessel <karl.koessel@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:20 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Karl Koessel

PO Box 257

Blue Lake, CA 95525

From: Louie Free <louiefree@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Louie Free

Vindicator Sq

youngstown, OH 44501

From: Greg Scott <Gregscott@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Greg Scott

1645 Miramesa Dr

1645 Miramesa Dr

Santa Barbara, CA 93109

From: Jerry Calhoun <justsayknowtobs@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jerry Calhoun

P.O. Box 2098

P.O. Box 2098

Lakeside, AZ 85929

From: Linda Redding CPA <lreddingcpa@ymail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:19 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Linda Redding CPA

PO Box 784

po box 784

LaPlata, MD 20646

From: Betty Walters <bjw_ena@ionsky.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:47 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Betty Walters

4053 Sunshine Canyon

Boulder, CO 80302

From: virginia houck <wellnessessentials@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:02 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

virginia houck

36 Tattersall lane

36 Tattersall lane

albany, NY 12205

From: Nikki Wojtalik <nwojtalik@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:36 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Nikki Wojtalik

3723 Green Oak Ct.

Parkville, MD 21234

From: Tara Warne <tarawarne@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:33 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Tara Warne

Columbia, MO 65201

From: Julia Burgess <juniper_98@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:06 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent

location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Julia Burgess

735 Parkhurst Drive

Lebanon, MO 65536

From: Jeremy Rossman <jeremysrossman@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 7:08 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Rossman

674 Driftwood Ln

Northbrook, IL 60062

From: Renate Haeckler <haecklers@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 5:27 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Renate Haeckler

2058 Kentucky River Road

Richmond, KY 40475

From: Caryn Graves <caryn@lmi.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:50 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Caryn Graves

1642 Curtis St.

Berkeley, CA 94702

From: Sharron c <sharron.coontz@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:47 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sharron c

3716 85th Ave. NW

Olympia, WA 98502

From: Michael Seager <michael_seager@att.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 12:12 AM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Michael Seager

8253 Westmoor Road

Mentor, OH 44060

From: Patricia Vazquez <patricia_vazquez77@yahoo.com.mx>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 11:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Patricia Vazquez

Taller 791, Ed. 7, apt. 402

Mexico City, ot 15900

From: Sarah Lynch <sarah7ann@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 11:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sarah Lynch

havertown, PA 19083

From: judith hazelton <pheralicious@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 10:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Judith Hazelton

1617 US Rt 7 S

Bennington, VT 05201

From: Lora Baker <bakerlora64@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 10:42 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Lora Baker

1812 Old US Hwy 40

Columbia, MO 65202

From: Joan Hanley-Hyde <joan.hyde@verizon.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 10:41 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Joan Hanley-Hyde

Rockville,, MD 20851

From: shelly frazier <fshell1602@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 9:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

shelley frazier

609 S. Boylan Ave.

Raleigh, NC 27603

From: Jeannette Bartelt <jmbartelt@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 9:49 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at

some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jeannette Bartelt

530 Ellrose Ct.

Frederick, MD 21703

From: Pecola Hamilton <loonytoon60@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 9:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of

accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Pecola Hamilton

11710 342nd Ave NE

342nd Ave NE

Carnation, WA 98014

From: Claire Garden <clairenova@juno.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 9:43 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Claire Garden

1404 Gary

Columbia, MO 65203

From: Suzy R <sfr@nj.rr.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 9:26 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary

and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Suzy R

One Main St

New York, NY 10101

From: Dawn Kimble <dawn.kimble@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 8:52 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Dawn Kimble

3980 St. Petersburg St.

3980 St. Petersburg St.

Boulder, CO 80301

From: Erica Gray <veggielady@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 8:51 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a

thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Erica Gray

406 Glendale Dr.

406 Glendale Dr.

Henrico, VA 23229

From: Susan Shapiro <palisadesart@aol.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 8:15 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to

phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Susan Shapiro

21 Perlman Drive

3301A Route 207

Spring Valley, NY 10924

From: Ann L. Grewe <annie.grewe@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 7:57 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject: Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Packing trucks and train cars with lethal high-level radioactive waste to move it to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly.

The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Or, pack the waste on a disposable spaceship and send it to the sun. Sunspots are greater than any of our nuclear bombs, the sun wouldn't notice the extra. Then support solar, wind, and hydroelectric which are all clean, renewable forms of energy generation.

Sincerely,

Ann L. Grewe

869 Barrymoore Loop

The Villages, FL 32162

From: Daniel Weiss <dweiss@moomail.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 7:11 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Daniel Weiss

161 Austin Drive - Apt. 106

Burlington, VT 05401

From: Jean Blackwood <blackwoodjean@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 6:59 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Jean Blackwood

103 North Stadium Blvd. Apt 113

Columbia, MO 65203

From: Sally Moore <sallymoore81@hotmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 6:45 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at some point, it should first make only the short move from the current fuel pools at reactors to dry containers at the same reactor site. Other movement must be only from that site to a permanent location for permanent isolation. A consolidated interim storage site would increase the risks of accidents and security problems while guaranteeing increased exposure to ionizing radiation along public-use highways, rails and waterways--even without an accident.

Further, the de-linking of an interim site from progress on a permanent solution found in both the discussion draft and even more objectionably in the Feinstein/Alexander alternative would serve only to delay permanent isolation of the waste from the environment and make it more likely that a temporary and unsuitable site would become a de facto permanent nuclear waste dump. No state or community should or would accept such an outcome--yet this proposed legislation would virtually ensure that.

I ask you to focus on public health, environmental protection and equity for the future rather than the narrow interests of the nuclear power industry--which would be the only beneficiary of such a thoughtless program. The best way to limit the scope of the radioactive waste problem is, of course, to phase out the use of nuclear power and replace it with clean energy sources. But for the waste that exists now, Hardened On-Site Storage and renewed work on finding a permanent solution is imperative.

Please scrap your "discussion draft" and start over.

Sincerely,

Sally Moore

15/321 Beaconsfield Parade

St Kilda, ot 3182

From: alice slater <aslater@rcn.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 6:37 PM

To: feedback, n waste (Energy)

Subject:Radwaste discussion draft is unacceptable

Thank you for focusing on the radioactive waste problem. It should be of utmost priority. The nation's high-level radioactive waste program is indisputably broken, but the Senate Energy Committee's "discussion draft" legislation would only exacerbate the problems.

Moving lethal high-level radioactive waste to a consolidated interim site would not fix any problems at all, and is simply unacceptable. No one charged with protection of public health, safety and security should mandate moving deadly radioactive waste repeatedly. While the waste will have to be moved at