

**From:** [J Kronick](#)  
**To:** [RulemakingComments Resource](#)  
**Subject:** [External\_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:02:46 PM

---

Dear NRC Commissioner NRC Commissioners and Staff,

Dear NRC Commissioners and Staff:

I am strongly opposed to NRC's proposed expansion of Categorical Exclusions (published 5-7-2021).

The NRC is seeking to avoid legitimate controversy, and to exclude further public input on over a dozen important and controversial impacts from the nuclear power fuel chain.

I don't believe ANY AMERICAN wants radioactive waste at any level released from nuclear control, or to get into regular trash and commercial recycling, which could make everyday household items radioactive. This proposal could result in that, despite decades of public opposition to "below regulatory concern" (BRC), "very low-level waste" (VLLW), and other generic exemptions from 10 CFR 20.2002 regulations.

I don't believe ANY AMERICAN wants even hotter nuclear waste to go to "low-level" waste sites.

I do believe continued and increased surveillance of closed uranium mills should be required, and is necessary to protect the American public from radioactive materials.

The American public needs more, not less, input on storage and transport cask designs.

The American public needs more input, not less, on decommissioning plans and funding assurance requirements for reactors, uranium facilities and the proposed Consolidated "Interim" Storage facilities.

The NRC MUST NOT be allowed to improperly reclassify actions which actually cause significant environmental consequences to avoid environmental review.

The NRC MUST NOT be allowed to assume there are no impacts from the numerous exclusions listed in the advanced notice of proposed rulemaking.

Furthermore, this subject proposal violates the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The NRC has not "provide(d) a reasoned explanation for the change(s)." And each change deserves its own environmental impact statement, not an exemption.

Categorical exclusions should not be expanded.

I believe the NRC should scrap this proposal and focus on reducing exclusions already allowed.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
J Kronick  
PO Box 345  
Lake Orion, MI 48361