

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
USNRC

From: marvin i lewis <marvlewis@juno.com>
To: <NRCREP@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jul 14, 2006 9:50 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG 1854 Part 2.

2006 JUL 14 AM 11:19

>From Marvin Lewis
3133 Fairfield St.
Phila., PA 19136
215 676 1291
marvlewis@juno.com

RECEIVED

To USNRC Commissioners
NRCREP@nrc.gov
Attn.: Anna Bradford

5/31/06
71 FR 00967

Dear Sirs and Ms,

Please accept this e mail as my comments on NUREG 1954 Part 2.
Financial problems.

The nuclear power industry has putting a part of its charges and moneys in a nuclear decommissioning fund. The IRS uses a section of their rules and regulations to allow these licensees to form 761 tax exempt partnerships. These 761 partnerships have been sending a large part of their investment overseas. I am sure that these funds will have a tough time coming back to the US for their intended purpose.

Under GATT, WTO and NAFTA, foreign countries will try to get part of the business and be able to sue domestic companies if they do not comply. Under GATT, the U S must allow world wide bidding for waste sites. The US will be in competition with very cheap labor and lands. The decision and awards would be decided in a secret tribunal which has a history of deciding against the US in the case of MTBE in Canada and bananas from a very small country. The result is that much of the waste that could be buried in near by sites will have to be trucked across the US and travel expenses are greatly expanded. The NUREG does

(2)

not explore this scenario. Nor does the NUREG 1854 explore and discuss the added costs and dangers of this scenario. I wonder how much the cost of a freighter grounding off the coast of Atlantic City will cost the

his ability to see site specifics.

that many areas of interest are not specified: sacredness (Many sites are on Native American sacred land), economics (Is this the best and highest use of resources?), pure water (Is this the best and highest use of this water quality in the area and future?)

Considerations expressed by Commissioner Jaczko:

Along the lines of public health and safety, many other issues remain unsettled.

1. Will the DOE definition of public health and safety equal the NRC requirement to be protective of public health and safety?

What recourse does the public have if the protection is inadequate?

A recent ruling by US District Judge Michael Baylson in *Colacicco v Apotex inc* suggests that the Federal preemption would prevail, and the only recourse would be to sue the Agency if the US government so allowed. That is not much recourse.

According to NRC Commissioner Jackson, 6-12-06, all disasters are local - that each community is unique and local emergency managers must have flexibility to adopt individual solutions.

Unlike the NUREG which attempts not to be prescriptive, Com. Jackson does point out that the lack of perceptiveness actually may hamper first responders and planners.

"I am unable to point to a section of our regulations that explains how long they (evacuations) should take because there is not one." This fluff, no real specific answers, pervades the NUREG without any real meat (answers to specific questions.)

One simple question: What is the probability that the waste will be isolated from the biosphere for the time that it is required to be isolated?

I would also like a definition for reasonable in percent and not fluff.

Things that no one thinks of:

I would like a discussion of the possibility with the new laser

off to hit buildings.

Building. I know . I saw the news in the local movie house a few weeks later. That was fast then.

What is the probability of a terrorist hitting a radioactive dump site and the results?

I do not expect the NRC to know the future. I do expect some effort to avoid 'Greek Tragedies.'

Respectfully Submitted,

Marvin Lewis

7-14-2006.

marv

Mail Envelope Properties (44B7A123.A30 : 14 : 6704)

Subject: Comments on NUREG 1854 Part 2.
Creation Date Fri, Jul 14, 2006 9:49 AM
From: marvin i lewis <marvlewis@juno.com>

Created By: marvlewis@juno.com

Recipients

nrc.gov
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
NRCREP

Post Office

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6484	Friday, July 14, 2006 9:49 AM
Mime.822	7604	

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
ReplyRequested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered

Junk Mail handling disabled by User
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator
Junk List is not enabled
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled
Block List is not enabled