

From: [Sally Jane Gellert](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 6:09:54 PM

Dear NRC Commissioner NRC Commissioners and Staff,

Dear NRC Commissioners/Staff:

#1: I am outraged by your updating the e-mail address so that my comments did not go through & I must resend—one could worry about conspiracies & suspect that you don't want to hear from us. I won't go that far—but it is not a good image for a government agency. Sadly, I do not have access to my specific individual thoughts that I added to this letter, which I carefully read and updated with my particular concerns, so will do my best to reproduce what I said earlier.

I strongly oppose NRC's appalling proposed expansion of Categorical Exclusions (published 5-7-2021). This is the exact opposite of our need.

It appears NRC wants to avoid legitimate controversy & generically exclude public input on >12 important and controversial impacts from the nuclear power fuel chain. Did I not just question the e-mail change? We the People need to be heard, often and completely—I was just on a call with the NY Public Service Commission, and we all agree that we do not trust you; too many exemptions, exclusions, & rubber-stamping of industry proposals.

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 is incredibly frightening; will I have to carry a Geiger counter everywhere? This proposal could make us unsafe anywhere, 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. Those of you in the industry or regulating it are used to dealing with deadly substances, & know how to take precautions—We the People do not, and should **not** be put in a position where we need to consider that. To you it is below concern; to us it is more dangerous than anything we encounter day-to-day, & we want none of it.

I do NOT want hotter nuclear waste to go to "low-level" waste sites.

I DO WANT continued & **increased** monitoring of closed uranium mills.

I WANT more, not less, input on storage & transport cask designs—and that means HOSS (hardened on-site storage), & **thick-walled** canisters.

I WANT more input, not less, on decommissioning plans & funding-assurance requirements for reactors, uranium facilities, & any proposed Consolidated "Interim" Storage facilities—an EJ disaster in the making.

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

I DO NOT want 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)," —each deserves its own environmental impact statement, not an exemption.

DO NOT expand categorical exclusions. NRC must scrap this proposal and focus on reducing current exclusions.

Sincerely

Sincerely,
Sally Jane Gellert
Woodcliff Lake, NJ 07677