

SUNI Review Complete
 Template=ADM-013
 E-RIDS=ADM-03
 ADD: James Park

As of: 10/15/20 4:32 PM Received: October 10, 2020 Status: Pending_Post Tracking No. 1k4-9jg3-x25v Comments Due: November 03, 2020 Submission Type: Web
--

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

Comment (33)
 Publication Date 5/8/2020
 CITATION 85 FR 27447
 PDM-07201051

Docket: NRC-2016-0231

Waste Control Specialists LLC's Consolidated Interim Spent Fuel Storage Facility Project

Comment On: NRC-2016-0231-0342

Interim Storage Partners Consolidated Interim Storage Facility Project

Document: NRC-2016-0231-DRAFT-0344

Comment on FR Doc # 2020-20964

Submitter Information

Name: Elliot Zashin

Address:

715 Asbury Ave.

Evanston, 60202

Email: emzashin@hotmail.com

General Comment

As a concerned citizen who has followed the debate about how to handle the wastes from our nuclear plants, I am aware of the complexities of determining what is the optimal solution (s). Though not an expert, I can see that the DEIS (Draft Environmental Impact Statement) fails to address many of these issues. Although a solution to the problems of nuclear waste is long overdue, the approval of the proposed project could create more problems than it will solve. To move forward with a dubious project will not serve the interests of the public. Indeed, it may result in many new negative impacts in the years to come.

I learned a good deal from listening to the comments of others who called in. Ultimately, the decision to approve the DEIS cannot be made just by considering the risks in various aspects of the proposed project impacts (e.g., from the transport of nuclear wastes by rail and the durability of the cannisters in which the waste will be shipped and stored). Deciding that they will be minor is not sufficient.

The NRC staff must convince the public that this proposed facility (if the DEIS is approved) will solve a problem the public wants solved. What will building an interim facility actually accomplish? Representatives of the nuclear energy industry indicated that it will allow decommissioned nuclear reactors to be emptied of their nuclear waste and the sites can then be restored to a usable condition, e.g., a public park. But it seems that what the proposal will actually do is will allow the nuclear energy industry to continue to maintain and perhaps even build new reactors - by claiming that a solution to the waste problem has been achieved. Continuing to rely on nuclear power - allegedly carbon-free - when our nation could move rapidly to replace

it with wind and solar energy - continues the risks and costs of nuclear energy plants. Without a permanent repository for nuclear wastes, the facility in Texas will not solve any long-term problem, it will merely give the impression that the NRC is making progress. And a private enterprise presumably will receive large amounts of federal revenue to operate the project.

Is this outcome really superior to leaving the nuclear wastes where they are? If the storage cannisters that are being proposed for transporting and storing are so durable, let them be used at the existing sites and omit the transportation to the Texas site altogether. If and when (no one seems to be sure about this) a permanent repository can be planned and implemented, then moving the wastes across the country might be justified. I believe the Texas project is misconceived and it appears that neither Texas nor New Mexico want it located at the proposed site.