

11/14/2016
81FR 79531

As of: 3/14/17 4:46 PM
Received: March 05, 2017
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 1k1-8v32-55nw
Comments Due: April 28, 2017
Submission Type: Web

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

91

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-0056

Comment on FR Doc # 2017-01966

Submitter Information

Name: Judy Crawford

2017
RECEIVED
MARCH 15 11 09 AM '17
FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF PHOENIX

General Comment

Do not be deceived by town spokespersons who claim, "In Andrews, it has never been controversial" (ex. director of Andrews Chamber of Commerce, Midland Reporter Telegram, March 5, 2017).

Though many of our neighbors benefit from the "generosity" or "greased palms", many of our residents are not swayed by WCS to look the other way, when health and possibly life itself are placed in such volatile environment.

I am firmly against this project.

Below is an excerpt from my presentation to the Commissioner's Court on Dec. 11, 2014. Though only a few of the points of contention, i.e., the low-level hospital waste we were considering at the time of it's inception...or at least that's what the town fathers told us we were storing, they are glossed over ... over run by the monetary force behind the project and those willing to risk so much for the almighty dollar.

Any industry which threatens the quality of air we breathe, our bodies' physical well-being, our mental capabilities ought to be curtailed.

That three vote margin to pass the bond in 2009 was not overwhelming local support. Over time additional wastes have been licensed and now even more volatile material requested, which does not mirror the initial presentation. Is no vote to be taken by the citizens on such an important issue? If voting is not required, was this tactic the plan from the beginning to expand and aggrandize initial investors (who do not live here) with token meetings?

Transparency about contamination issues at WCS in 2005 and 2007 was not provided to residents. Have there been other incidences? Are a few instances acceptable and to be expected?

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

REFS = ADM-03
Add = J. Park (JRP)

Job creation and increased tax base at the risk of public welfare does not seem to be a wise investment. It borders on placing the dollar above quality human life.

Not documented, but I recall the heavy rainfall in September 2014 causing concern at the site. (KOSA news report).

Finally, issues of ground water contamination remain paramount. Our oil production and fracturing put enough stress on the land. The Ogallala Aquifer requires responsible care; we must put a priority on keeping it safe for consumption.

Considering the above issues, I believe WCS should not proceed with this changed storage status. I find it suspicious that this was brought to light with less than two months' notice to the public. Though increased economic gain is enticing, it should not be a higher priority than the safety and quality of life for people who actually live in Andrews.

Respectfully submitted.

Judy Crawford