

From: Charles Schmalz <charliisch@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2020 7:00 PM
To: WCS_CISFEIS Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] No nuclear waste in Texas

Dear Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

Dear NRC Commissioners and Staff,

Interim Storage Project of the NRC is an oxymoronic nonsequitur; if that's a stretch, since you fail to notice this consequential term, means: "it does not follow...". But to even apply to store radioactive waste in Texas to bring in 40,000 tons of spent nuclear fuel from nuclear reactors around the country, as if to store for whatever amount of time, would presuppose you are asking another agency of this same Government, presumably to borrow an uninsurable liability to ever clean it up, as the risk is astronomically not a leak-free, risk-averse Superfund Cleanup. Re. Fukushima or Chernobyl. Why not buy both of those sites at market value, and use their hot spots to cool your futures in fossil fuel abatement to top it off? Unless of course could fund the whole mess, by selling municipal bonds, bundled as Futures to North American, State Teachers' Unions. They've been dumbed down to bankrupting all of their present futures (now until the Soviet Republik of the United States of Trump where denying future elections will have succeeded in passing by a futures Popular Vote, for a President who signs Executive Orders threatening every cross-threat undermining sanity.

Would the plan target a Latinx community with deadly nuclear waste. considering stored waste would be at risk from earthquakes, sinkholes, temperature extremes, wildfires, intense storms and flooding: an increasing prospect on each front, they say.

Besides being an illegal approach that does not solve our nuclear waste problem; with this proposal, the NRC has ignored expert testimony, local opposition, and tens of thousands of written and oral comments.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement is deficient because it fails to:

- Account for disproportionate impacts to low-income communities of color (environmental justice communities) in the American Southwest and along transport routes.
- Details transportation routes and consider nationwide risk to millions of Americans along transport routes.
- Consider the risk of leaks, sabotage or transportation accidents.
- Include a plan to repackage leaking waste casks and a plan to move waste when required.
- Complete the required alternatives analysis by considering Hardened Onsite Storage Systems (HOSS) as an alternative to Consolidated Interim Storage.
- Consider past nuclear waste accidents that have cost hundreds of millions to billions of dollars to clean up.
- Detail cumulative impacts of the proposed facility and nearby sites on workers, local people, and the environment.
- Analyze potential for groundwater contamination.

I oppose Consolidated Interim Storage at this and other sites. The DEIS fails to adequately analyze environmental and cumulative impacts and the socioeconomic risks of the proposed radioactive waste storage application. Protect public health and safety, as if the economy and the environment, depends on saving West Texas, first among all the longitude/latitude sites remaining.

Sincerely,
Charles Schmalz
635 E Main St
Greenwood, IN 46143

Federal Register Notice: 85FR27447
Comment Number: 6537

Mail Envelope Properties (bfa90b4a-4c5c-48ef-84a1-919d750d3a5b)

Subject: [External_Sender] No nuclear waste in Texas
Sent Date: 10/13/2020 7:00:20 PM
Received Date: 10/13/2020 7:00:44 PM
From: Charles Schmalz

Created By: charliisch@comcast.net

Recipients:

Post Office: salsalabs.org

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3122	10/13/2020 7:00:44 PM

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