

ADMRegs-Holtec-CISFEISCEm Resource

From: ADMRegs-Holtec-CISFEIS Resource
Sent: Monday, July 2, 2018 8:20 AM
To: ADMRegs-Holtec-CISFEISCEm Resource
Subject: HOLTEC DRAFT#-0160 #193
Attachments: NRC-2018-0052 Comment 193.pdf

Holtec CISF
FDMS Comment Number:
DOCKET ID: NRC-2018-0052
83-FR-13802

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013
E-RIDS=ADM-03
ADD= Antoinette Walker-
Smith, Jill Caverly (JSC1)

As of: 7/2/18 8:17 AM
Received: July 01, 2018
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 1k2-9413-4duy
Comments Due: July 30, 2018
Submission Type: Web

COMMENT (193)
PUBLICATION DATE:
3/30/2018
CITATION # 83 FR 13802

Docket: NRC-2018-0052

Holtec International HI-STORE Consolidated Interim Storage Facility Project

Comment On: NRC-2018-0052-0058

Holtec International HI-STORE Consolidated Interim Storage Facility Project

Document: NRC-2018-0052-DRAFT-0160

Comment on FR Doc # 2018-10418

Submitter Information

Name: Annette Dussia

Address:

2162 Sugar Pine Way

Las Cruces, NM, 88012

Email: brutucus12@hotmail.com

General Comment

To whom it may concern,

My wife and I are residents of Las Cruces NM. We are against the proposed "temporary" storage of high level nuclear waste on private land between Hobbs and Carlsbad NM. First, it is labeled "temporary" but there is no plan as to where the permanent storage facility will be located. Nor is there a time frame stated as to how long this "temporary" storage will take place in this suggested location. To move this material without a permanent plan seems an unnecessary risk. Especially since these trains will be going through populated towns and cities.

It does not seem to be a completely formulated plan or the plan is to just leave it at this location long term and this is just not being said. Neither is acceptable. We the public have a right to have a say in where this material is stored. If this is the permanent plan then we need to know that and if it is not then there needs to be a complete plan in place and we should know that as well.

Finally, we do not quite understand the need to move this material from the current "temporary" storage facilitates to another "temporary" facility. It seems to be unnecessary risk to the public in the moving of the material. Why not just move it to a permanent place? This whole plan feels dishonest.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter,

Annette Dussia and Diane Hart