

WCS_CISFEISCEm Resource

From: Stephen Makovec <steve.makovec@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2017 2:09 PM
To: WCS_CISFEIS Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Docket ID NRC=2016-023

To the Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing against the application from Waste Control Specialists' (WCS) to store tons of irradiated nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste from nuclear reactors around the country in Andrews County, Texas.

- First, they would make thousands of unnecessary shipments of nuclear waste across the US.
- Can you see the risk?!?

Risks of Transporting Nuclear Waste:

- As you prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for WCS's nuclear-waste storage application, I urge you to include the risks of transporting toxic waste on our country's highways, railways and waterways.
- The EIS for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or malicious attacks that could occur along those routes.

24 Years of Risk Transporting Nuclear Waste

- If the license would be approved, deadly waste would be transported through communities, farmland, sensitive natural areas and watersheds throughout the country -- for 24 years.

Please extend the public-comment period for 90 more days to enable parties along all these potential routes to become informed and enter their comments!

Risks to Local Groundwater:

- The EIS should independently review the risk of groundwater contamination at the site.
- Note that the entire Texas Commission on Environmental Quality Radioactive Materials Division recommended denying a license for "low-level" radioactive waste at the Waste Control Specialists site due to the proximity of groundwater.

Risks of Accidents:

The EIS should consider potential impacts from accidents or radioactive-waste-related acts of malice along transport routes and at the site, including impacts to people, land and water.

- We need in-depth research about radiation monitoring and cumulative impacts of multiple facilities near the WCS site; site security; engineering adequacy of the storage pad and seismic stresses; and the adequacy of the crane that would move radioactive waste.

Local Community Does Not Consent:

- The local community has not consented to becoming a national radioactive waste dumping ground.
- They should not risk contamination of their land, aquifers or air or the health of people, plants, wildlife and livestock.

Risks of Temporary Site Becoming Permanent:

- The EIS should address the impacts if the "interim storage" sites become nearly permanent, and the possibility that the dangerous waste might never be disposed of in a sound geologic repository using a reliable isolation system.
- With political pressure gone, the waste would likely never move again.

These risks - when included in your review – make the decision to reject WCSs application clear. Thank you for reading and heeding my recommendation!

Sincerely,

Stephen Makovec

45459

Federal Register Notice: 81FR79531
Comment Number: 2719

Mail Envelope Properties (1359814741.21577.1487876969973.JavaMail.tomcat)

Subject: [External_Sender] Docket ID NRC=2016-023
Sent Date: 2/23/2017 2:09:29 PM
Received Date: 2/23/2017 2:29:36 PM
From: Stephen Makovec

Created By: steve.makovec@gmail.com

Recipients:

Post Office: vweb203

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2893	2/23/2017 2:29:36 PM

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: