

From: [Larry McFall](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:27:22 PM

Dear NRC Commissioner NRC Commissioners and Staff,

Dear NRC Commissioners and Staff:

NRC's proposed expansion of Categorical Exclusions (published 5-7-2021) is WRONG. It is the worst of many crazy ideas that you have supported on behalf of the nuclear industry.

For this proposal, you should rename the NRC. Call it The Non-Regulating Nuclear Commission.

The 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.

NO ONE in their right mind wants 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 DO NOT want the NRC to improperly reclassify actions which actually cause significant environmental consequences to avoid environmental review.

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

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.

I DO NOT want you to expand categorical exclusions. The NRC should scrap this proposal and focus on reducing exclusions already allowed.

I DEMAND MORE, NOT LESS, input on storage and transport cask design

I DEMAND MORE, NOT LESS, input on decommissioning plans and funding assurance requirements for reactors, uranium facilities and the proposed Consolidated "Interim" Storage facilities.

What you want to do is monstrous. The consequences will be far reaching. Even the commissioners will not be safe from the harm that you will have unleashed on the world if you persist.

Sincerely,
Larry McFall
20 Hanover Ct.
Santa Cruz, CA 95062