

WCS_CISFEISCEm Resource

From: Stephen Lane <atticlane@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2017 10:00 PM
To: WCS_CISFEIS Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Docket ID NRC=2016-023

To the Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

A license to Waste Control Specialists' (WCS) allowing them to store irradiated nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste in Andrews County, Texas, would 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 urge you to include the risks of transporting that toxic waste on our country's highways, railways and waterways.

If the license is approved, deadly waste would be transported through communities, farmland, sensitive natural areas and watersheds throughout the country for 24 years. The EIS for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include designate transportation routes and the impacts of accidents or malicious attacks along those routes. The public comment period should be extended for 90 more days to enable parties along all these potential routes to comment.

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 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. 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, 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 their land, aquifers or air or the health of plants, wildlife and livestock.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming 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.

These risks - when included in your review – make the reasons to reject WCS's application clear.

Sincerely,

Stephen Lane

20816

Federal Register Notice: 81FR79531
Comment Number: 9754

Mail Envelope Properties (1670139372.22163.1487905184008.JavaMail.tomcat)

Subject: [External_Sender] Docket ID NRC=2016-023
Sent Date: 2/23/2017 9:59:44 PM
Received Date: 2/23/2017 10:59:58 PM
From: Stephen Lane

Created By: atticlane@yahoo.com

Recipients:

Post Office: vweb40

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2360	2/23/2017 10:59:58 PM

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