

Office of Administration

Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

Washington, DC 20555-0001;

Attn: Cindy Bradley

RE: Docket No. 72-1050; NRC-2016-0231 Waste Control Specialists LLC's Consolidated Interim Spent Fuel Storage Facility Project

RECEIVED

March 9, 2017

Dear Cindy Bradley and NRC,

11/14/2016
81 FR 79531

141

Waste Control Specialists' (WCS) application to import tons of spent fuel, high-level radioactive waste, from nuclear reactors around the country and store it in Andrews County for 40 years (or longer) should be halted in order to protect public health and safety.

The Environmental Impact Statement should include transportation routes and the potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents along those routes on public health and safety. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for more than 20 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. We hear assurances that accident damage would be minimal, but real life disasters have been known to exceed the worst anticipated scenarios. A 2014 Texas Commission on Environmental Quality report warns of potential sabotage of radioactive waste shipments, saying that such an incident would most likely occur in a large city rather than a rural area. Terrorist actions involving radioactive waste in Dallas/ Ft. Worth would be an unimaginable nightmare.

The EIS should look closely into the risk of groundwater contamination at the site, especially since the entire TCEQ 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 consider potential impacts from accidents or radioactive waste related terrorist actions along transport routes, including impacts to people, land and water. In-depth research should examine radiation monitoring and cumulative impacts of multiple facilities near the WCS site, site security, engineering adequacy of the storage pad and seismic stresses, the adequacy of the crane that would move radioactive waste.

The report should include exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, as it appears there would be no wet pool or hot cell built and it appears that no one knows yet how to transfer waste from dry cask to dry cask. WCS should have to explain how this would be accomplished and not just say they'll figure it out when the problem arises.

Please know that I don't consent to our state becoming a national radioactive waste dumping ground. We should not have to risk contamination of our land, aquifers or air or the health of plants, wildlife and livestock. Human exposure to high-level radioactive waste can lead to immediate death. Homeowners' insurance doesn't cover radioactive contamination. A single rail car could haul waste containing as much plutonium as the bomb dropped on Nagasaki.

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM - 013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = J. Park (SRP) -

J. Guintero
(Jmmt)

Storing the nation's high-level radioactive waste in an area that is largely Hispanic would be a huge environmental injustice, and the impacts to the nearest communities and within a 50-mile radius of the site need to be carefully analyzed. Income levels should be examined as well in the socioeconomic analysis.

The environmental report should address the impacts of "interim storage" at the site becoming a dangerous permanent de facto disposal. With political pressure gone, the waste would likely never move again. Above-ground casks would be exposed to the weathering effects of temperature extremes, and potential wildfires, tornadoes and earthquakes. At what point could the waste go critical?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application in the Dallas/Ft. Worth region so that Texans who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Carol McBecker
568 West 31st
Holland, Mich. 49423