

**From:** [Carol Jagiello](#)  
**To:** [RulemakingComments Resource](#)  
**Subject:** [External\_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:10:12 PM

---

Dear NRC Commissioner NRC Commissioners and Staff,

Dear NRC Commissioners and Staff:

I oppose NRC's proposed expansion of Categorical Exclusions (published 5-7-2021). It appears NRC wants to avoid legitimate controversy and generically exclude further public input on over a dozen important and controversial impacts from the nuclear power fuel chain.

Every single proposal represents outrageous negligence by NRC to deregulate or eliminate vital protections that have been in existence for decades. NRC knows the health and environmental impacts of these proposals yet here they are. NRC should be strengthening regulations for the benefit of public safety, public health and the public good. Again these proposals are simply an outrage and must be withdrawn immediately.

Donors and "friends" should not be a factor in public health and safety regulations if this is a reasoned explanation or related matter. Un scrupulous companies with past a history of bribery, fraud and other bad acts should not be rewarded by the NRC or the federal government as they seek to remake the nuclear waste industry their new business focus. By granting the regulatory relief you seek would play quite nicely to their goals. By eliminating regulations you are creating the perception that waste isn't so bad - see it's even in the landfills - oh you didn't know? Too bad - it's fine. So when the accidents inevitably occur of thin shelled storage or waste pits or travel spills, etc. you / they can say - oh's it's okay - not so bad - don't worry.

The NRC is obligated to have the very highest standards in protecting the public. - this is a mockery.

I do NOT want radioactive waste at any level released from nuclear control, to get into regular trash and commercial recycling, which could make everyday household items radioactive. This proposal could do 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 do NOT want even hotter nuclear waste to go to "low-level" waste sites.

I DO WANT continued and increased surveillance of closed uranium mills.

I WANT more, not less, input on storage and transport cask designs.

I WANT more input, not less, on decommissioning plans and funding assurance requirements for reactors, uranium facilities and the proposed Consolidated "Interim" Storage facilities.

I DO NOT want NRC to improperly reclassify actions which actually cause significant environmental consequences to avoid environmental review.

I DO NOT want NRC to assume there are no impacts from the numerous exclusions listed in the advanced notice of proposed rulemaking.

This proposal violates the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

NRC has not "provide(d) a reasoned explanation for the change(s)," and each of them deserves its own environmental impact statement, not an exemption.

DO NOT expand categorical exclusions. NRC should scrap this proposal and focus on reducing exclusions already allowed.

Sincere

Sincerely,  
Carol Jagiello  
91 Wood Pl  
Bloomingdale, NJ 07403