11/14/2016
81FR79531

146

Humberto Acosta
1010 SW 5th ST
Andrews, TX 79714

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001

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

March 8, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

Our group has been working diligently inside and outside the community gathering letters from people that oppose the storing of high level radiation waste in Andrews County. Enclosed are letters about what should be included in the scoping of the Environmental Impact Statement for Waste Control Specialists' application.

We are having overwhelming success in acquiring signatures, and would easily have more signatures with more time. People here are very concerned.

We have been talking to many people, and they all express a great concern about how this could affect the future of their children and all future generations. Through our involvement and talking to the public, we have also found that many of the people do not speak English fluently and are ignorant of the facts, and thus an ignorant public can be taken advantage of very easily.

I would also like to bring to your attention that the meeting held in Andrews, TX on the 15th of February 2017 from 7PM to 10PM was held on a Wednesday night, precisely at the same time that most of the people attend their Church services, so consequently they were unwilling to skip Church to attend the meeting.

We are not convinced that WCS has an overwhelming monopoly on helping our community. There are plenty of other companies and businesses that employ people. The throwing of "crumbs" by WCS in the form of a few scholarships and donations to our community do not justify putting us in danger. The long term potential dangers, proportionally, by far, outweigh the benefits.

We suggest that WCS should stay "low level" and continue to be a part of our community. We suggest that you take this and the other letters included in this package under careful consideration before granting WCS the license to store

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM – 013
E-RIDS= ADM-03
Add= J. Park (JRP) J. Quinter (JMM7)

high level radiation waste in Andrews County.
We understand the need to find a place to store the dry casks in a safe, permanent secure place, but we also believe that the proposed "temporary" storage in Andrews County will eventually turn into a permanent nightmare. We suspect that once the casks arrive in Andrews County, the pressure to move the waste any further would be off and they will be here "forever".

On a moral note, if you will, we also think that our four commissioners and one Judge that signed the resolution, represent a very small percentage of the population and therefore, considering the circumstances, should not have the power to determine the future of our community, given the long life span of the waste materials and the unjust involvement of our future generations that do not have a voice in this matter.

Sincerely,

Humberto Ruiz

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Arturo De Las Rios JR

Arturo Delaltorre

Email: arturo7174@aol.com

Phone: 432-266-0108

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

3-2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Wilma Carter

Wilma Carter

Signature

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: 432 524 2144

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Megan Dosier

Signature

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email:

Phone: (432) 701-1163

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

_____.__, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Lorenzo Lopez

Lorenzo López
Signature

200 NE Ave E
Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: 524 3723

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

_____.__, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Alejandra Lopez.

Alejandra Lopez.
Signature

414 NE AVE F. 79714
Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: 432-847-6273.

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

_____.___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely Hortencia Garcia

Hortencia Garcia

Signature

1001 SW 5th.

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: 432 664 9802

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

_____.__, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Laura Olivas
Signature

411 SE 2nd Street Andrews, Texas 79714
Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: olivaslaura0022@gmail.com

Phone: (432) 631-0913

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

_____.__, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,



Signature

414 N.E. Ave. F Andrews Tx 79714

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: Ø

Phone: 432-528-1537

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

_____.__, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Diana Lopez

Diana Lopez

Signature

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: 432-631-7258

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

3.9._____, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, DIAMANTINA. LOPEZ.

Diomantina Lopez
Signature

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: 432. 524.3723

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

_____.__, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Jaime de los Ríos

Jaime de los Ríos

Signature

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

_____.__, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Andrea Franco
Signature

703 SW 5th Andrews, TX 79714
Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: francoandrea@rocketmail.com

Phone: 432-664-1475

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

_____.__, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Dulce Pacheco

Signature

506 SE 3rd St. Andrews TX. 79714

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

_____.__, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Domingo Pacheco

Signature

506 SE 3rd St. Andrews TX. 79714

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

_____.__, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Efren Pacheco

Signature

507 SE 2nd St. Andrews TX. 79714

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

_____.__, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Amparo Pacheco
Signature

506 SE 3rd St. Andrews TX. 79714
Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

_____.__, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Mary Bella De los Rios

Mary Bella De los Rios

Signature

907 NE 6th

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: 432-258-4073

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Jacqueline Tarango

Signature Jacqueline Tarango

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: (432)847-8188

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb 27, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Brenda DeLosRios

Brenda DelosRios
Signature

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: (432) 770-1739

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. __, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Eduardo Martinez

Email: imartinez199626@gmail.com

Phone: 432-266-0758

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Camelia Alvarez

315 NW 16th

Email: MrsAlvarez2008@aol.com

Phone: Camelia Alvarez

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Jose Alvarez

JOSE M. ALVAREZ

1315 11th

Email: [redacted] Mr.Jalvarez@gmail.com

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Jessica Alvarez



1315 NW 16th

Email: Jessie.M.Alvarez@gmail.com

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Graciela Prendis

I live in Andrews TX.
1003 NE Mustang Dr. Andrews TX

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

RE: Docket No. 72-1050; NRC-2016-0231 Waste Control Specialists LLC's Consolidated Interim Spent Fuel Storage Facility Project
March
~~Feb.~~ __, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Trevor Mims

Trevor Mims

Email: trevor.mims@gmail.com

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Gabby Lopez

Gabby Lopez

Email:

Phone: 432-269-8862

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

_____.__, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Paula Hernandez

Paula Hernandez

Signature

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: 638-4809

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Laquita Westbrook

3712 Bowie Ave

Odessa Texas

Email: _____

Phone: 432-385-6366

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, 13075 W. Citation Dr.
Odessa, Tx 79764
(210) 584-9173

Email: dakota945@gmail.com

Phone: Dakota Lee

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ __, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Arturo Morales

Arturo Morales

712 Parker St

Email:

Phone: 432-640-96-24

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ 5, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, deseray morales

Deseray Morales

712 Parker St. Andrews TX 79714

Email: dtarango0520@gmail.com

Phone: 432-631-2106

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, María del Socorro Esparza

María del S Esparza
1609 SE 3001 Andrews, Tx 79714

Email: Madelso@.Yahoo.Com

Phone: (432) 524-7118 or 557-5937 (4321)

Additional comments: Please think about our Childrens futuro... We don't want it! Thank you

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Otilia Flores

Otilia Flores
601 NE Ave C.

Email: _____

Phone: 432-523-0164

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Padilla

Elizabeth Padilla,
3472 SE 2000 Unit B

Email: eepiakis@yahoo.com

Phone: 432 640 9407

Additional comments: There are many factors that would put this High-Level Radioactive waste dump at risk here in Andrews, TX. We want to be risk-free. Please take this all in consideration. Thank You.

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 28th, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Ileana Saenz,

Ileana Saenz

3172 SE 2000 Andrews, TX 79714

Email: ileana.esparza@yahoo.com

Phone: 432-556-8050

Additional comments:

I want my children to grow up the way I did, in a non-high level radioactive zone/environment.

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Grace Underwood

Grace Underwood

1700 SE 6001, Andrews, TX 79714

Email: Kipp_under@yahoo.com

Phone: 432-523-4216

Additional comments: The risks are too great.

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Nathaniel Flores

Email: _____

Phone: 432-425-9540

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Ever Flores

Email: _____

Phone: 432-523-0164

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

2 23, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Signature

912 NW 13th St Andrews, Tx. 79714

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: Cla9SSmithe hotmail.com

Phone: 217-495-0990

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Februai 23, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Maria Medrano

Maria Medrano

Signature

3125 W 8th

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: MM272830@gmail.com

Phone: (432) 557-1285

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb 23, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Mendoza

Elizabeth Mendoza

Signature

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb 23 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Sonia Contreras Duran

Sonia Contreras.

Signature

605 NW 15th Apt. #120

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: (432) 847-7298

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb 26, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Ismael Gonzalez

Signature

2770 Estate Hwy 176 Andrews, TX 79714

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb 28th, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Adrian Gonzales

Signature

Po Box 2122
Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: Adrian@going4th.com

Phone: 432-425-5738

Additional comments:

The people of Andrews, the youth do not want nuclear waste (high level), and neither do the majority of Andrews. The city council does not ask us individually.

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb 21, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Padilla

Elizabeth Padilla
Signature

3172 SE 2000 unit B
Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: eeflakis@yahoo.com

Phone: 432 640 9407

Additional comments:

The people of Andrews feel betrayed and discouraged because of this probable decision. Can't believe this decision was based ONLY upon 4 commissioners and 1 judge. Their will can't and shouldn't be enforced on the people of Andrews, especially on such important decision! Please keep this in consideration.

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

RE: Docket No. 72-1050; NRC-2016-0231 Waste Control Specialists LLC's Consolidated Interim Spent Fuel Storage Facility Project
March
~~Feb.~~ __, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Manuel Marquez

Andrews TX.

Email:

Phone: (432) 557-2213

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Sylvia Villa

Sylvia Villa

210 SW 1900 Andrews Ty

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,



Email: AdrianaLechuga02@gmail.com

Phone: 432-258-0719

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ 05, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,



Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Francisco Chavira

Francis Chavira

Email:

Phone: 432-209 7482

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March 4, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Daniel Cisneros
Signature

711 NW 6th st Andrews TX 79714
Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: 432 202 2822

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March 4, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Estefany Lechuga
Signature

711 NW · 6th st Andrews Tx 79714
Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: 432 202 2822

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March 4, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Maria de Jesus Perez
Signature

711 NW 6th st Andrews Tx 79714
Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: 432 223 8995

Additional comments:

0

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, ROLANDO CONTRERAS

ROLANDO CONTRERAS

607-N-F-AVE-E&I ANDREWS TEXAS 79714

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Rosa Contreras

Rosa Contreras

607 N. E. Ave E Place Andrews Texas 79714

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

_____.__, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Reynaldo J Miranda
Signature

1021 SE 3001 - Andrews, Tx 79714
Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: MRARanda47@yahoo.com

Phone: 432-523-3470

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

_____.__, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Maria L Aranda

Signature

1021 SE 3001 - Andrews, TX 79714

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: MRARANDA47@yahoo.com

Phone: 432-523-3470

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Auden Carrasco

Email: ~~Auden Carrasco~~

Phone: (432) 208-9954

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Eliana Carrasco

Email:

Phone: (432) 425-2871

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ __, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, M. Bueno

Email: mbueno@andrews.esc.18.Net

Phone: (432) 238-2027

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

RE: Docket No. 72-1050; NRC-2016-0231 Waste Control Specialists LLC's Consolidated Interim Spent Fuel Storage Facility Project
March
~~Feb.~~ __, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Jesus Elizondo

Jesus Elizondo

401 NE 5th

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Aurora Ortiz

Aurora Ortiz
620 SE 2401 P.O Box 173

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Maria T Blanco

Maria T Blanco

Email:

Phone: 432-258-0719

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Mildred Ortiz

Mildred Ortiz

620 SE 2401 Andrews TX

P.O Box 173 Andrews TX 79714

Email: _____

Phone: 432-664-4039

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

RE: Docket No. 72-1050; NRC-2016-0231 Waste Control Specialists LLC's Consolidated Interim Spent Fuel Storage Facility Project
March
~~Feb.~~ ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Magdalena Saucedo

Email: 1115 N E 4th pl Andrews TX 79714

Phone: 432-312-8240

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

RE: Docket No. 72-1050; NRC-2016-0231 Waste Control Specialists LLC's Consolidated Interim Spent Fuel Storage Facility Project
March
~~Feb.~~ __, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Sayra K. Munoz

515 SW 2nd St.
Andrews TX 79714

Email: sakamuso@gmail.com

Phone: (432) 307-8797

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Dalila Bustamante
195 SE 1290, Andrews, TX 79714

Email: dalilabustamante@ymail.com

Phone: 432-308-2553

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ __, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Marcela Chavez

Marcela Chavez

Email: 308 SW 4th St

Phone: 432-556-8950

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

_____.__, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Jesus Ibarra

Signature

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

8

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Rita Tarango

Email: _____

Phone: 432-294 0414 Andrews TX 79714

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Jahayra Hinojos

Jahayra Hinojos

3642 SE 2000 Andrews, Tx. 79714

Email: jahayrahinojos1981@gmail.com

Phone: 432-223-8311

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Maria Malpica

Maria Malpica
1490 SE 6001

Email: maria.malpica09@gmail.com.

Phone: (432) 894-5693

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

2/26/17, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Adriana Carranza

Signature

2130 SE 1000

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: AdrianaCarranza3242@yahoo.com

Phone: 432-266-2096

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Gabriel Trevizo

Gabriel Trevizo

81 SE 1290 Andrews Tx 79714

Email:

Phone: 432-438-2556

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Tomasa Garcia

Tomasa Garcia

Email: 1470 SE 6001 Andrews TX

Phone: 432-638-5286

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb 26 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Cristal Carranza

Cristal Carranza

Signature

2130 SE 1000 Andrews TX 79714

Address/City/State/Zipcode

Email: KKisto-23@hotmail.com

Phone: (432) 264 1317

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, George Logan

Email: georgeg@martinsinc.com

Phone: 432-425-8997

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Karina Krijan

Email: karluj22@gmail.com

Phone: 432 894 6651

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Cinthia Garcia

1470 SE 6001

Andrews TX. 79714

Email: cindyg1992@yahoo.com

Phone: 956 205 5390

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Teodoro Lopez

Teodoro D. Lopez

703 NE 54th pl

Email: _____

Phone: 432 425 5513

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Yolanda Lopez

Yolanda Lopez

703 NE 4th pl

Email: _____

Phone: 432 425 5513

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Susan A. Stark

3-3-17

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

S. Becky Rodriguez

Email: bgonzrod@gmail.com

Phone: 432 425 0219

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Maria Gonzales

P.O. Box 594
Email: Andrews Texas 79714

Phone: 432-425-1691

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

February 28, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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.

Please know that we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, [signature]

Amanda Lujan

Email: mandylujan81@gmail.com

Phone: 432-425-5659

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Dalila Gonzalez

Email: dalilagonz88@gmail.com

Phone: (432) 266-0972

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Jose Baeza

Jose Baeza

1465 SE 1000 Andrews TX 79714

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Deida Baeza

Deida Baeza

1465 SE 100th Andrews TX 79714

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

Feb. 2, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Sara Lynn Salinas

Email: saralynn2911@gmail.com

Phone: 432 238-7550.

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Miguel Banda

Andrews TX

Email:

Phone: (432) 425- 3766

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Victor Fuentes

Email: _____

Phone: 432 - 244 - 2346

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

RE: Docket No. 72-1050; NRC-2016-0231 Waste Control Specialists LLC's Consolidated Interim Spent Fuel Storage Facility Project
March
~~Feb.~~ ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Fernando Rubio

803 N.E. 44th St. Andrews TX 79714

Email: FXRubio30@Gmail.com.

Phone: (432) 631-4379

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Cruz Rubio

Veralilia Rubio

Email:

Phone: 432-924-1492

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, JOSE CHAVIRA José Chavira

515 SW 2nd St

ANDREWS TX 79714

Email: joa1chpo@aol.EMAIL

Phone: 432-209-94-94

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Jose G Gallegos

Email: josegrad120@gmail.com

Phone: (432) 894-0741

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-HO8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ __, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Luis Bustamante

195 SE 1290, Andrews TX 79714

Email: luis@mustangenergy.biz

Phone: 432-894-1012

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ 5, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Anacleto Silva

Email: garciasilva12@gmail.com

Phone: 915-276-5065

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

RE: Docket No. 72-1050; NRC-2016-0231 Waste Control Specialists LLC's Consolidated Interim Spent Fuel Storage Facility Project
March
~~Feb.~~ 05, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Raquel Ortiz Gtz

81 SE 1290 Andrews Tx. 79714

Email:

Phone: 432 276 0067

Additional comments:

Cindy Bladey
Office of Administration
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001;

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

March
~~Feb.~~ ___, 2017

Dear Cindy Bladey and NRC,

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, including the health and safety of my constituents.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Waste Control Specialists' license application should include a designation of transportation routes and the array of potential impacts of accidents or terrorism incidents that could occur along those routes. If the license gets approved, deadly waste would be transported through our region for 24 years. Even one small accident would be one too many. Despite assurances that accident damage would be minimal, 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 the San Antonio region 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 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, 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 at the WCS site. 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 we don't consent to 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. We've had serious train accidents in our region. Two trains have collided head-on in West Texas last year at 65 mph. I understand that cask testing has been conducted for accidents up to 60 mph, but this scenario has already been exceeded. The EIS should address these risks.

The EIS should address the impacts of "interim storage" becoming dangerous permanent de facto disposal, and the waste might never be disposed of in a scientifically viable geologic repository using a reliable isolation system. 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. The EIS should address these issues and answer the following questions: At what point could the waste go critical? What interactions of these circumstances and contact with other radioactive waste and hazardous materials at the WCS site could occur? What are the cumulative impacts of waste at this site and nearby sites on workers, local people and the environment, and how could natural disasters impact add to impacts?

Please host a hearing on the WCS application so that those of us who would be put at risk can address the NRC on this important issue. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely, Domitilo Guevara

2756 SE 200

Andrews TX 79714

Email:

Phone: 305-796 1721

Additional comments: