

WCS_CISFEISCEm Resource

From: d w <d70w@LIVE.COM>
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 6:26 PM
To: WCS_CISFEIS Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Comments on the Scope of the EIS for WCS's application

Hello,

I attended the public forum in Andrews, TX, however, I wanted to submit my comments on the scope of the EIS for WCS's application via email.

My comments / questions are as follows:

- 1) In other areas of the country, depletion of groundwater has been blamed for sinkholes. I understand that in a lot of cases, these sinkholes occur in areas with a limestone under-layer and the depletion of ground water is assumed to cause a weakening in the limestone support structure. Will there be any consideration in the scope of the EIS in regards to the depletion of the Ogallala aquifer and the potential relationship to the stability of the ground at the WCS storage site?
- 2) I know that studies have been performed in the past in regards to the potential for interim and long term storage of nuclear waste to contaminate ground water. Has any consideration ever been given to the possibility of nuclear contamination spreading to the oil and natural gas deposits that surround the WCS site?
- 3) Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking) is a fairly common practice in this area to extract additional / hard to get deposits of oil and natural gas. Fracking has been blamed (right or wrong) for a significant increase in earthquakes where the practice is common. Oklahoma is a strongly sighted example. Will the EIS consider the potential effect of fracking on the seismic classification of the WCS site?
- 4) Continuing with the previous thought, will the EIS establish a current baseline for seismic activity in the area and then create recommendations / contingencies should the seismic activity change in the future?
- 5) Strong wind is a common feature in this area of the country. Any release at the site is likely to travel a significant distance if the proper wind conditions exist at the time of the release. Will the EIS consider establishing a baseline at the site and at the center of the city and then recommend the installation of monitoring devices to alert the population to any possible harmful releases and measure the quantity of the release?
- 6) Andrews County employs a volunteer fire department. I am assuming that the volunteer fire department would be called upon to address any fire or harmful release at the WCS facility. The fire department is 30+ miles from the WCS site and as a volunteer fire department it is not constantly staffed with personnel ready to deploy. Will the EIS study consider requiring WCS to provide for an on-site 24 hour / 7 day a week fire and hazmat response crew similar to what you would see at a major airport? Having a crew on-site dedicated to addressing any fires or hazardous situations would greatly reduce the response time and hopefully limit the damage and potential environmental impact.
- 7) Will the EIS consider recommending WCS install environmental and container integrity monitoring sensors at the site and having them monitored on site 24 hours a day, 7 days a week?

I sincerely appreciate your consideration of these concerns.

If you require any further clarifications, please do not hesitate to contact me at this email address. D70w@live.com.

Sincerely,
David

Federal Register Notice: 81FR79531
Comment Number: 14420

Mail Envelope Properties (BY2PR16MB0391F6C7D4B626531505325AB7200)

Subject: [External_Sender] Comments on the Scope of the EIS for WCS's application
Sent Date: 3/10/2017 6:26:25 PM
Received Date: 3/10/2017 6:26:30 PM
From: d w

Created By: d70w@LIVE.COM

Recipients:

Post Office: BY2PR16MB0391.namprd16.prod.outlook.com

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3242	3/10/2017 6:26:30 PM

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