

WCS_CISFEISCEm Resource

From: Joan Christensen <bdubois0937@frontier.com>
Sent: Monday, November 19, 2018 11:56 PM
To: WCS_CISFEIS Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] WCS nuclear waste dump public comment

I am totally opposed to proposed nuclear waste dump in West Texas and New Mexico for the following reasons:

1. The public comment plan is inadequate, especially for a project with such potential for catastrophic consequences. Public meetings must be scheduled, and public comment instructions must be printed in Spanish, since the site and transfer routes are home to high concentrations of Hispanic people, who would be most affected by this proposal. And these people often do not have the resources to relocate, should nuclear contamination make these areas uninhabitable.
 2. Why should W. Texas and NM “pay” for other states’ benefitting from nuclear power by assuming their nuclear waste problems. These areas are inhabited by poor and minorities and have experienced environmental racism for decades in the form of disproportionate impact by hazardous and toxic wastes without compensation. Each state deciding and benefitting from nuclear energy should have to figure out its own permanent storage solution—not hand it off to these areas.
 3. The risk of transporting ALL commercial high level nuclear power waste—100,000 tons—from all over the country on rails, roads, and waterways, over 20-40 years, is totally unacceptable. None of the certified waste containers are designed for transport conditions (temperature, crashes, submersion in water. Although NRC claims these casks have been tested, they are not the same casks that will be used. The potential for nuclear incidents because of accidents or deliberate sabotage is too great. And this is only a temporary waste dump, so all this waste will have to be moved again, doubling the risk.
 4. Storage could easily exceed the expected life of storage containers. What if no permanent storage site is found after 40 years? These containers cannot be monitored for potential leaks and cracks, and there is no current technology that would allow recontainerizing of them when they fail. There is no facility nor funds designated to do this.
 5. This area is seismically active. Large fracking and other extractions are close to the site, possibly even beneath the site itself. The area is subject to extreme temperatures, sandstorms, floods, strong storms including tornadoes which can endanger the containers. It is also close to a uranium enrichment site exposing the storage site to additional risks from accidents, releases, and explosions. In addition, consolidating all this waste is the first step to extracting plutonium which would make it vulnerable to terrorist attacks.
 6. The company is seeking a permit to release hazardous radioactive waste to the NM side of the property which has nearly major aquifers.
 7. Consolidation of irradiated fuel is illegal until there is a permanent operating repository.
3. Interim Storage Partners who wants to build this massive storage facility won’t do it unless the ownership of the waste is transferred to the US taxpayers. This means we must pay for transporting it and storing it while this company reaps the profits. This will cost us billions of dollars. Taking on this responsibility will have two major additional serious consequences. It will make operating nuclear plants more profitable and slow or stop scheduled closures and make it possible for nine states to open new nuclear plants. These nine states currently have laws prohibiting new plants from being build until a storage solution for waste is found. More nuclear energy means more nuclear waste, greater risk of disastrous terrorist attacks, environmental impacts from the huge amounts of water necessary to cool and operate

reactors especially in areas suffering extreme drought (1/4 of all nuclear plants), more safety related incidents, and greater risk for undetected stealing of plutonium. In short, this proposed interim nuclear waste storage solution props up the dying nuclear power plant industry with all its problems, when we need to concentrate our efforts to replace it with clean renewable energy.

Joan Christensen
3292 County Rd. 24
Intl Falls, MN 56649

Federal Register Notice: 83FR44922
Comment Number: 27133

Mail Envelope Properties (E945AE7D-B850-4565-A8B1-F509EB51995C)

Subject: [External_Sender] WCS nuclear waste dump public comment
Sent Date: 11/19/2018 11:56:02 PM
Received Date: 11/19/2018 11:56:19 PM
From: Joan Christensen

Created By: bdubois0937@frontier.com

Recipients:

Post Office: frontier.com

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4108	11/19/2018 11:56:19 PM

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