

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 5/23/18 12:22 PM
Received: May 15, 2018
Status: Pending Post
Tracking No. 1k2-9362-nkuv
Comments Due: May 15, 2018
Submission Type: Web

Docket: NRC-2018-0026
Very Low-Level Radioactive Waste Scoping Study

Comment On: NRC-2018-0026-0001
Very Low-Level Radioactive Waste Scoping Study

Document: NRC-2018-0026-DRAFT-0036
Comment on FR Doc # 2018-03083

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013
E-RIDS=ADM-03
ADD= Kellee Jamerson

Submitter Information

Name: Elizabeth Zimmer-Lloyd
Address:
1631 Wells St.
Port Huron, MI, 48060
Email: 2BethLloyd@gmail.com

COMMENT (#36)
PUBLICATION DATE:
2/14/2018
CITATION # 83 FR 6619

General Comment

Concerning docket ID # NRC201800260001 My name is Elizabeth Zimmer Lloyd, I am a mother of 8 children, grandmother to 21 grandchildren and I am writing to voice my opposition to this, as there is NO "safe" dose/exposure to radioactive wastes! Period. I believe this proposed policy change is reckless & poses a real threat to me, my family and the countless wildlife & fauna (& ALL future generations) in our environment that it will be negatively impacted by it.

Regarding question #1, of this scoping study, my answer is: There is NO reason to create a "new category" regarding nuclear wastes. This proposition WASTE taxpayers \$ (& your departmental \$) doing this & to me, is only an attempt to make more \$, at our health's expense & unnecessarily risks detrimental harm to our Mother Earth.

Regarding question #2, my answer is: NO! The NRC should use ALL resources available to continue (& increase) its regulatory handling of these harmful wastes, with more ACCURATE documentation of them, especially as more nuclear facilities are and will be decommissioned! WE NEED better accounting of the nuclear wastes, these facilities have amassed & they should NOT be spread over a vast area of our country.

Regarding question #3: NO! (& why not?) Because making this somehow generic (creating a new VLLW category) will be detrimental to the very public who is supposed to be being PROTECTED (BY THE NRC) FROM such radioactive wastes, also not allowing any knowledge (warning) to OR input from the public. Isn't it bad enough that the NRC allows this (recklessly) on a case by case basis, as in 10 CFR 0.2002? Regarding question #4: We the people (whether an agreement state or not) should NOT BE pressured by, nor have the NRC make policy that would pressure us to "follow suit" AND the NRC should clarify the legal right, for each state to be able to retain its own policy to maintain its own requirements for radioactive regulatory control.

Regarding question #5: If the NRC tries to define LLRW, to remove or "exempt" radioactive control, each state still has authority over such material. If the NRC wants to impose such changes to this, then they need to go through congress, to attempt to make such changes. NRC "internal policy changes" should NOT supersede each state's right to decide how to deal with radioactive materials.

Regarding question #6: There is NO justifiable reason to allow radioactive wastes being put into solid and hazardous waste facilities. The ONLY reason one would consider this, is because it's basically cheap to place them there, rather than a regulated nuclear waste facility. For over 30 years, we the people, have stopped this from occurring, for OBVIOUS REASONS, and there's no need to change that now (other than \$ being saved/made by the industry, & other private industries, in an attempt to cheaply dispose of & make more \$ from these dangerous materials, at the public and environment health expense).

Regarding question #7: Does it really matter if it's "intentional" or not? Considering, in developing a new category of VLLW it doesn't change the fact that these materials should be continuously regulated, monitored and ISOLATED from the environment, until such a time as they are no longer CONTRARY TO ALL LIFE ON THE PLANET. PERIOD. Basically the NRC is tasked with ensuring the protection of public health, BY isolating these materials, to be sure that NO ENTITY in our environment is exposed to it's penetrating/ionizing negative effects, forever. This proposal means to spread these materials into areas ill equipped to isolate or even track them & is such an irresponsible proposal. It's OBVIOUS that this proposal is an attempt to "privatize the gains, while socializing the losses".

Regarding question #8: My goodness, use REAL science for clues as to how to address radioactive wastes. AND/OR simply ask ANY CHILD who endured the Chernobyl or Fukushima disasters, if they think exposure to low level radioactive materials are "safe" or if this is a "good idea" (NO "formal" nuclear degrees are needed. I mean C'MON, it's common sense, that this is a BAD IDEA!

Regarding question #9: The NRC is apparently incapable of adequately assessing the true economic effects this will have, considering they still haven't even admitted that exposure to nuclear fallout or nuclear wastes has a negative impact on public health AND the subsequent negative impact it has on the environment (despite EXTENSIVE radioactive exposure data, having been collected (for DECADES) from studies done on the people of the Marshall Islands, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, our own military people & right here in the U.S. in Nevada, New Mexico, etc.)