

As of: 2/22/17 2:29 PM
Received: February 16, 2017
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 1k1-8us1-d391
Comments Due: March 13, 2017
Submission Type: Web

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

Docket: NRC-2016-0231
Waste Control Specialists LLC's Consolidated Interim Spent Fuel Storage Facility Project

Comment On: NRC-2016-0231-0005
Environmental Reviews: Waste Control Specialists, LLC; Consolidated Interim Spent Fuel Storage Facility Project

Document: NRC-2016-0231-DRAFT-0010
Comment on FR Doc # 2017-01966

19

11/14/2016

81 FR 79531

Submitter Information

Name: Betty J. Van Wicklen
Address:
41 Lake Shore Dr. #2B
Watervliet, NY, 12189-2915
Email: bvanwick@nycap.rr.com

RECEIVED

FEB 22 PM 2:15

RULES OF PROCEDURE

General Comment

I am adamantly opposed to the proposal in Docket ID NRC-2016-0231.

The proposal would involve a temporary solution, rather than a permanent one.

The proposed site seems to single out an area of poverty and minority settlement, which seems to discriminate against those citizens. That such an area is relatively isolated from urban areas, while laudable, does not mitigate the impression of discrimination in siting (and thereby, risk).

The proposal would transport radioactive waste by barge, endangering the water systems and adjoining towns and land en route to the disposal site.

According to the Union of Concerned Scientists and Beyond Nuclear, the safest way to dispose of reactor waste materials is to leave the reactor rods on site, in strengthened and continuously monitored waste pools of water. The issue of safe transport of these materials is too dangerous to attempt - it would only take one accident to contaminate a large portion of the country (including farmland, infrastructure, waterways, groundwater, towns, cities, etc.) for decades or more.

Investment in non-permanent parking 'dumps' would be better used to strengthen the current waste pool

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM - 013
E-RIDS= ADM-03
Add= J. Park (JRP)

system and its monitoring, rather than investing in yet another temporary solution, which as we know, usually winds up being more than temporary, with additional problems (which are then blamed on the 'temporary' nature of the 'solution').

Recent natural disasters, which only mark the early stages of the violent weather associated with our changing climate, should make the creation of additional nuclear reactors a non-starter, not worth the dangers inherent in construction and maintenance or the huge expense of building them. I repeat, the safest method of disposal of nuclear waste materials already created is to strengthen the onsite waste pools and closely monitor their integrity and security until a truly viable permanent solution is found.

Thank you for the opportunity to share these concerns with you.