

WCS_CISFEISCEm Resource

From: George Czerw <gczerw@ec.rr.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2017 1:34 PM
To: WCS_CISFEIS Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Docket ID NRC=2016-023

To the Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

In my opinion, Waste Control Specialists' (WCS) application to store tons of irradiated nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste from nuclear reactors around the country in Andrews County, Texas, will cause thousands of unnecessary nuclear waste shipments across the US.

As you prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) of WCS's nuclear waste storage application, I strongly urge that you include an enumeration of 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 clear designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or malicious attacks that could occur along those routes. If this license is approved, deadly waste would be unnecessarily transported through communities, farmland, sensitive natural areas and watersheds throughout the country for 24 years.

I firmly believe that the public comment period should be extended for 90 more days to enable all parties along all these potential routes to comment.

Furthermore, the EIS should independently review the risk of groundwater contamination at the site, especially since 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.

The EIS should also consider the 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. In-depth research should examine radiation monitoring and the 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.

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

The EIS should also address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming a dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the possibility that the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. Once political pressure has been removed, the radioactive waste would likely never be moved again.

When the full impact of all these risks have been studied and included in your review, it becomes clear that you should make the decision to reject WCSs application.

Thank-you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

George Czerw

28465

Federal Register Notice: 81FR79531
Comment Number: 7248

Mail Envelope Properties (432864701.19908.1487874864418.JavaMail.tomcat)

Subject: [External_Sender] Docket ID NRC=2016-023
Sent Date: 2/23/2017 1:34:24 PM
Received Date: 2/23/2017 6:34:40 PM
From: George Czerw

Created By: gczerw@ec.rr.com

Recipients:

Post Office: vweb217

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2758	2/23/2017 6:34:40 PM

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