

From: [Sandra Dal Cais](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:14:15 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Sandra Dal Cais
4534 48th St
Woodside, NY 11377

From: [Michael Karp](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:14:17 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Michael Karp

12115 Mesa Verde Dr
Valley Center, CA 92082

From: [Robert Gibb](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:14:17 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Robert Gibb
5036 Revenue St
Homestead, PA 15120

From: [Jim Clapp](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:14:18 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Jim Clapp

24613 N Melissa Dr

Detroit Lakes, MN 56501

From: [Connie Kline](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:14:23 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Connie & Mike Kline

Sincerely,

Connie Kline

Willoughby Hills, OH

From: [Johanna Lindsay](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:14:25 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Johanna Lindsay
39570 Benavente Pl
Fremont, CA 94539

From: [Rev. Raymond Brown](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:14:35 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Rev. Raymond Brown
1999 W Sassafras St
Selinsgrove, PA 17870

From: [Nina Tatlock](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:14:36 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Nina Tatlock

1413 Beach Club Ln

Apollo Beach, FL 33572

From: [Melissa Mazias](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:14:38 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Melissa Mazias

2032 Prentiss Dr Apt 310

Downers Grove, IL 60516

From: [Joanne Britton](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:14:39 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Joanne Britton
6670 Shannon Ave
San Diego, CA 92115

From: [Robert Meyer](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:14:39 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Robert Meyer
4421 Baker Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98107

From: [Sharon Logan](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:14:45 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Sharon Logan
505 Waring Rd
Rochester, NY 14609

From: [Stephanie Huntington](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:15:08 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Stephanie Huntington
2280 Hudson St
Denver, CO 80207

From: [Claudia Van Gerven](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:15:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Claudia Van Gerven
727 Ithaca Drive
Boulder, CO 80305

From: [Kevin Rolfes](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:15:17 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Kevin Rolfes

14006 N Green Hills Loop

Austin, TX 78737

From: [Scott Kennedy](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:15:20 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Scott Kennedy

6027 Sir Lancelot Ct NE

Keizer, OR 97303

From: [june bullied](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:15:22 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
june bullied
2108 55th street
Boulder, CO 80301

From: [Andrew Kurzweil](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:15:40 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Andrew Kurzweil
2343 E 18th St
Brooklyn, NY 11229

From: [Thomas Nieland](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:15:51 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Thomas Nieland
415 Oakwood Dr
Alamo, TX 78516

From: [Mark Bartleman](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:15:53 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. 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.

Thank you,

Sincerely,
Mark Bartleman
1984 Del Mar Ave
Laguna Beach, CA 92651

From: [Sheila Erlbaum](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:15:55 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Sheila Erlbaum

7150 Bryan St.

Philadelphia, PA 19119

From: [karen milstein](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:15:55 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
karen milstein
13 Blue Jay Dr
Santa Fe, NM 87506

From: [Peter Urquhart](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:15:55 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Peter Urquhart

6528 Wilson Mills Rd

Cleveland, OH 44143

From: [Gavin Dillard](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:15:56 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Gavin Dillard

528 Padgettow Rd

Black Mountain, NC 28711

From: [nancy hartman](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:16:06 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
nancy hartman
839 Mariposa Rd
Lafayette, CA 94549

From: [Ken Gibb](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:16:17 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Ken Gibb

PO Box 11616

Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

From: [Peter Gunther](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:16:32 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Peter Gunther

5636 N. Spaulding Ave.

Chicago, IL 60659

From: [Laura Newton](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:16:52 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Laura Newton

37894 Melrose Dr

Cathedral City, CA 92234

From: [william dotson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:16:56 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
william dotson
PO Box 241106
Anchorage, AK 99524

From: [Christine Popowski](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:16:58 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Christine Popowski
2630 Pleasant Ave Apt 101
Minneapolis, MN 55408

From: [Linda Wasserman](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:17:18 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Linda Wasserman
1510 N Steele St
Tacoma, WA 98406

From: [Carol Soto](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:17:20 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Carol Soto
1643 Castro
SF, CA 94114

From: [B Soltis](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:17:29 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

B Soltis

690 Hopewell Rd
Downington, PA 19335

From: [Reto Pieth](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:17:32 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Reto Pieth

409 Route 121 E

Grafton, VT 05146

From: [Raymond Nuesch](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:18:02 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Raymond Nuesch
4555 Catterton Rd
Free Union, VA 22940

From: [R Austin](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:18:06 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

R Austin

PO Box 142

Birchrunville, PA 19421

From: [Donald Wenger](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:18:06 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Donald Wenger

13217 Aurora Dr Spc 63

El Cajon, CA 92021

From: [Rebecca Swanson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:18:12 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Rebecca Swanson
2642 E Westfall Rd
Mariposa, CA 95338

From: [Marc Silverman](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:18:18 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Marc Silverman

Los Angeles, CA 90068

From: [Marc Silverman](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:18:19 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Marc Silverman

Los Angeles, CA 90068

From: [Lu Conklin](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:18:22 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Lu Conklin
4064 S Kendall St
Flagstaff, AZ 86005

From: [Julie Adelson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:18:44 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Julie Adelson

2810 6th St

Santa Monica, CA 90405

From: [Marsha Jarvis](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:19:38 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Marsha Jarvis
512 Kenmare Ct
Pinole, CA 94564

From: [Cheryl Dzubak](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:19:51 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Cheryl Dzubak
69 Elton Ave
Trenton, NJ 08620

From: [Carolyn Ryan](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:20:09 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Carolyn Ryan

12716 Karenway Ct

Saint Louis, MO 63146

From: [Laura Sheinkopf](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:20:23 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Laura Sheinkopf
9 Court St
Belfast, ME 04915

From: [Kathy Guest](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:21:14 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Kathy Guest

24301 Brown Rd

South Bloomingville, OH 43152

From: [Michael Carter](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:21:29 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Michael Carter

6830 Silver Ln

Annandale, VA 22003

From: [Jenna Carodiskey-Wiebe](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:21:32 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Jenna Carodiskey-Wiebe
35005 18th Ave SW
Federal Way, WA 98023

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

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Obie Hunt
1150 Grand Concourse
Bronx, NY 10456

From: [Anne Small](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:23:00 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Anne Small

704 River Rd

Church Hill, TN 37642

From: [Susan Mulcahy](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:23:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Susan Mulcahy
6838 E Osborn Rd
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

From: [Pat Bulla](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:23:26 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Pat Bulla
7202 Foxtree Cv
Austin, TX 78750
512-345-9528

From: [Mary O'Donnell](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:23:29 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Mary O'Donnell

455 stonebridge Blvd

New Castle, DE 19720

From: [Sister Kathleen Corbett](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:23:31 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Sister Kathleen Corbett
820 Fir
Las Cruces, NM 88001

From: [Rebecca Rose](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:23:32 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Rebecca Rose

2850 Fairway Dr, Apt. 28

Las Cruces, NM 88011

From: [Mari Mennel-Bell](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:23:55 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Mari Mennel-Bell

1440 S. Ocean Blvd.

Lauderdale by the Sea, FL 33062

From: [Donna Bonetti](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:24:07 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Donna Bonetti

1170 B Monroe Drive

Boulder, CO 80303

From: [Beverly Ann Conroy](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:24:14 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Beverly Ann Conroy
2980 Gibraltar Road
Fish Creek, WI 54212

From: [Barbara Geiger](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:24:17 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Barbara Geiger

943 Riversedge Cir

Annapolis, MD 21401

From: [Chris Hazynski](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:24:20 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Chris Hazynski

17 Gate Ct

Burlington, NJ 08016

From: [Shanan Snyder](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:24:25 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. 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.

Sincerely,
Shanan Snyder

Sincerely,
Shanan Snyder
Ypsilanti, MI

From: [Amy Anderson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:24:25 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Amy Anderson
PO Box 655
Mc Intosh, FL 32664

From: [Margaret Loomis](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:24:25 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Margaret Loomis
10206 Day Ave
Silver Spring, MD 20910

From: [Reguel Steinbock](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:24:28 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Reguel Steinbock

1720 2nd Ave S Birmingham Alabama

Birmingham, AL 35294

From: [Edith Belcher](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:24:59 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Edith Belcher

132 Stoney Brook Dr

Van Lear, KY 41265

From: [Bradley Buchanan](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:25:10 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Bradley Buchanan
4072 Crow Valley Road
eastsound, WA 98245

From: [WALTER TERRELL](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:25:11 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

WALTER TERRELL
830 Hollywood Ave
Bronx, NY 10465

From: [Lori Wilson-Hopkins](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:25:44 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Lori Wilson-Hopkins
12070 Peregrine Way
Auburn, CA 95603

From: [Joanna Katz](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:25:45 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Joanna Katz
1320 Addison St
Berkeley, CA 94702

From: [Jan Modjeski](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:26:32 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Jan Modjeski

4315 Lotus Ct Unit A

Murrells Inlet, SC 29576

From: [Ben Gordon](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:26:34 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Ben Gordon

P.O. Box 71443

New Orleans, La., LA 70172

From: [Holly Cohen](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:26:36 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Holly Cohen
408 Sheffield Ct
Brewster, NY 10509

From: [Margaia Forcier-Call](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:26:57 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Margaia Forcier-Call

PO Box 43

Jemez Springs, NM 87025

From: [Lauren Linda](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:26:59 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Lauren Linda

2376C Via Mariposa West

Laguna Woods, CA 92637

From: [Patricia Savage](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:27:01 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Patricia Savage

PO Box 100

Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

From: [Mark Warren](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:27:08 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Mark Warren

Madison Heights, MI 48071

From: [Cee Ceedon](#)
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:

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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Cee Ceedon
Englewood, FL

From: [I. Engle](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:27:25 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

I. Engle

605 Bosque St.

Village of Tularosa, NM 88352

From: [Stephen Bailey](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:27:26 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Stephen Bailey
4778 Edward Dr
Deming, WA 98244

From: [sarah.jaeschke](#)
To: [RulemakingComments.Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:27:28 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

sarah.jaeschke

1821 5th Ave

San Rafael, CA 94901

From: [Mark Warren](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:27:28 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Mark Warren

Madison Heights, MI 48071

From: [Lenore Reeves](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:27:30 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Lenore Reeves

19934 Hickory Stick Ln

Mokena, IL 60448

From: [Susan Gardner](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:27:34 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Susan Gardner

3708 S Marshall Dr

Independence, MO 64055

From: [Rev. L. Cline](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:28:36 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Rev. L. Cline

4 Lorraine Ct

Riverhead, NY 11901

From: [Marcella Hammond](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:29:02 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Marcella Hammond
3156 Muir Field Rd
Madison, WI 53719

From: [Scott Messick](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:29:04 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Scott Messick

46 Camino de Los Arroyos
Ranchos de Taos, NM 87557

From: [Frances Goff](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:29:05 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Frances Goff

37 S Sierra Madre Blvd

Pasadena, CA 91107

From: [j roberts](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:29:06 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

j roberts

4205 se 102nd Ave

Portland, OR 97266

From: [Victoria DeSarno](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:29:15 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Victoria DeSarno
607 S Benson Rd
Fairfield, CT 06824

From: [Richard Tregidgo](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:29:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Richard Tregidgo
1146 Sunnyside Dr
Holtwood, PA 17532

From: [Will Ware](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:29:17 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Will Ware

12014 SE 19th Ave

Portland, OR 97222

From: [Stephan Livingstone](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:29:17 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Stephan Livingstone
350 Pearl Street 1707
Eugene, OR 97401

From: [Judith Garson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:29:18 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Judith Garson

647 Western Ave

Albany, NY 12203

From: [Lynn Shoemaker](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:29:32 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Lynn Shoemaker

172 N Esterly Ave

Whitewater, WI 53190

From: [JL Angell](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:29:34 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
JL Angell
2391 Ponderosa Rd
Rescue, CA 95672

From: [Rev. Allan B. Jones](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:29:57 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. 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.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Rev. Allan B. Jones
131 Colgan Avenue #1001
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

From: [Charlene Lauzon](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:30:02 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Charlene Lauzon
5715 202nd St SW
Lynnwood, WA 98036

From: [Ian Harvey](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:30:04 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Ian Harvey
San diego, CA 92101

From: [T. F.](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:30:18 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

T. F.

New York, NY 10016

From: [Linda Whitley](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:30:55 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Linda Whitley
123 McLellan Ave
San ateo, CA 94403

From: [Jennifer York](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:32:08 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Jennifer York

666 Wagnon Rd

Sebastopol, CA 95472

From: [Ian Harvey](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:32:13 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Ian Harvey
San diego, CA 92101

From: [Barrie Stebbings](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:32:25 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Barrie Stebbings

7224 Snow St

Sebastopol, CA 95472

From: [Patricia Fleetwood](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:33:03 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Patricia Fleetwood
5203 t.c. Steele Rd
Nashville, IN 47448

From: [Richard Thomas](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:33:45 PM

Dear NRC Commissioner NRC Commissioners and Staff,

Dear NRC Commissioners and Staff:

1. 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.
 2. 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.
 3. I do NOT want even hotter nuclear waste to go to "low-level" waste sites.
 4. I DO WANT continued and increased surveillance of closed uranium mills.
 5. I WANT more, not less, input on storage and transport cask designs.
 6. I WANT more input, not less, on decommissioning plans and funding assurance requirements for reactors, uranium facilities and the proposed Consolidated "Interim" Storage facilities.
 7. I DO NOT want NRC to improperly reclassify actions which actually cause significant environmental consequences to avoid environmental review.
 8. 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).
9. 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.
 10. DO NOT expand categorical exclusions. NRC should scrap this proposal and focus on reducing exclusions already allowed.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Richard Thomas
1766 Campbell Dr
Pisgah Forest, NC 28768

From: [JOHN PRYBYLSKI](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:33:49 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

JOHN PRYBYLSKI

20 Mayberry Dr. - E.

CHEEKTONWAGA , N.Y. 14227 A SUBURB OF BUFFALO , N.Y., NY 14227

From: [pablo voitzuk](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:34:13 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
pablo voitzuk
5405 Broadway
Oakland, CA 94618

From: [Brian Schwartz](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:34:26 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Brian Schwartz
406 Gaitway Ct
Freehold, NJ 07728

From: [Jean Cheesman](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:34:29 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Jean Cheesman
1111 Garcia Rd
Santa Barbara, CA 93103

From: [Debbie Nelson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:34:30 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Debbie Nelson
4422 McCleester Dr
Spring, TX 77373

From: [Peter Broderson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:34:32 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Peter Broderson

608 Fulton Road

Tallahassee, FL 32312

From: [Eric Lambert](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:34:32 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.

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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Eric Lambert
7122 N Oatman Ave
Portland, OR 97217

From: [Nancy Gillis](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:34:33 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Nancy Gillis

10720 blix st

North Hollywood, CA 91602

From: [Leann Enos](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:34:35 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Leann Enos
402 North Park Ave
Easton, CT 06612

From: [doug franklin](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:34:36 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

doug franklin

383 Boundary St

Waynesville, NC 28786

From: [Ian Shelley](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:34:36 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Ian Shelley
50 SW 97th Ave
Portland, OR 97225

From: [Michael And Barbara Hill](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:34:37 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Michael And Barbara Hill
701 Mineral Hill Rd
Mineral, WA 98355

From: [Neil Freson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:34:43 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Neil Freson
26 Bitternell Lane
Henrietta, NY 14467

From: [Shari Horne](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:34:59 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Shari Horne

3C 2354 Via Mariposa West

Laguna Woods, CA 92637

From: [June Meek](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:35:40 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

June Meek

4716 E 88th St

Garfield Heights, OH 44125

From: [Jean Fallon](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:35:58 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Jean Fallon

10 Pinesbridge Road'

Ossining, NY 10562

914-941-7575

From: [Robert Kaiser](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:36:34 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Robert Kaiser

PO Box 5510

Whitefish, MT 59937

From: [Marie Curtis](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:36:43 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Marie Curtis
7 Robin Dr
Oakhurst, NJ 07755

From: [Steve Bear](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:36:58 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Steve Bear

220 Pocket Ln

Port Townsend, WA 98368

From: [Virginia Jones](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:36:59 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Virginia Jones

2929 Nazareth Rd. ,Apt.232

Kalamazoo, MI 49048

From: [Rosewind Veilove](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:37:14 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Rosewind Veilove
San Diego, CA

From: [Gary Lofgren](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:37:23 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Gary Lofgren

6700 S. Brainard Ave.

Countryside, IL 60525

From: [RUSSELL HODIN](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:37:27 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. 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 the proposed changes 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

RUSSELL HODIN
1570 HANSEN LN
SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA 93401

From: [Laura Dufel](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:38:05 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Laura Dufel

1929 Cassia Rd Apt 300

Carlsbad, CA 92011

From: [Timothy Mullen](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:38:10 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Timothy Mullen
1272 Richland Avenue
Saint Charles, MN 55972

From: [Cindy Borske](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:38:15 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Cindy Borske
Manchester, IA

From: [Emma Goode-DeBlanc](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:38:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Emma Goode-DeBlanc
9100 Forest Xing
Spring, TX 77381

From: [Cindy Borske](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:38:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Cindy Borske
Manchester, IA

From: [Mal Gaff](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:38:25 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Mal Gaff
801 W Ocean Ave
Lompoc, CA 93436

From: [Suzan Michele Powers](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:39:04 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Suzan Michele Powers
1713 Ross Circle Apt.2
San Jose, CA 95154

From: [Melvin Sheets](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:39:04 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Melvin Sheets

699 Allendale Rd

New Brighton, PA 15066

From: [Arthur Richard](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:39:06 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Arthur Richard

767 Dunlap Cir

Winter Springs, FL 32708

From: [Carolyn Stallard](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:39:11 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Carolyn Stallard

222 Hidden Valley Rd

Soquel, CA 95073

From: [Bob Bousquet](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:39:14 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Bob Bousquet

PO Box 101

Bryantville, MA 02327

From: [Joan Balfour](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:39:44 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Joan Balfour

6249 Copper Lake Ct
Boynton Beach, FL 33437

From: [Ronit Corry](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:39:48 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Ronit Corry

1711 Pampas Ave

Santa Barbara, CA 93101

From: [Barbara Snell](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:39:49 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Barbara Snell
910 Belvedere Dr
Gallatin, TN 37066

From: [Terre Dunivant](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:40:26 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Terre Dunivant

Lawton Avenue

San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

From: [Hugh Moore](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:40:29 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Hugh Moore

1720 S Hobart Blvd

Los Angeles, CA 90006

From: [Linda Greene](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:40:33 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Linda Greene

2227 S Forest Estates Dr

Spokane, WA 99223

From: [Lucymarie Ruth](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:40:35 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Lucymarie Ruth

3761 Park Boulevard Way

Oakland, CA 94610

From: [william elwood](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:40:40 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
william elwood
423 E High St
Waynesburg, PA 15370

From: [Randi Saslow](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:40:41 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Randi Saslow
71 E Gate Ln
Hamden, CT 06514

From: [Jessica Palenchar](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:40:58 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Jessica Palenchar
979 Virginia St
Dunedin, FL 34698

From: [Bonnie German](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:41:33 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Bonnie German

3405 York Rd

Rochester Hills, MI 48309

From: [Ginnie Preuss](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:41:37 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Ginnie Preuss
405 Ruth St
bridgeport, CT 06606

From: [Louis Zeller](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:41:43 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Louis Zeller

PO Box 88

Glendale Springs, NC 28629

From: [Jeremiah Davis](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:42:09 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Jeremiah Davis
130 E Centennial St
Rapid City, SD 57701

From: [Sandra Joos](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:42:11 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Sandra Joos
4259 SW Patrick Pl
Portland, OR 97239

From: [Frances Hatfield](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:42:38 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Frances Hatfield

1821 Calle de Sebastian

Santa Fe, NM 87505

From: [George Crocker](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:42:50 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
George Crocker
5093 Keats Ave. N.
Lake Elmo, MN 55042

From: [BENNIE WOODARD](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:43:03 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

BENNIE WOODARD
3645 7th Ave N
Saint Petersburg, FL 33713

From: [Michael Ankelman](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:43:04 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Michael Ankelman
456 Oak St
Saint Louis, MO 63119

From: [Ming Ong](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:43:06 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Ming Ong

1907 Misty Woods Dr

Duluth, GA 30097

From: [Vikram Sikand](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:43:07 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Vikram Sikand

39 King Ave

Weehawken, NJ 07086

From: [Lorraine Brabham](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:43:14 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Lorraine Brabham
932 Bloomfield St
Hoboken, NJ 07030

From: [Keith Tse](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:43:28 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Keith Tse

New York City, NY

From: [Keith Tse](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:43:56 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Keith Tse

New York City, NY

From: [Lyn Strangstad](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:44:02 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Lyn Strangstad

327 Doty St

Mineral Point, WI 53565

From: [James McConkey](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:44:04 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
James McConkey
1475 Stonefield Dr
Dekalb, IL 60115

From: [Mitch Stargrove](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:44:07 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Mitch Stargrove
25665 SW Wolsborn Ave
Hillsboro, OR 97123

From: [CONNIE ST JEAN](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:44:11 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. 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.

Sincerely, connie st jean and family

Sincerely,
CONNIE ST JEAN
17956 Krameria Ave
Riverside, CA 92504

From: [Phyllis Arist](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:45:20 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Phyllis Arist
945 Ridge Ave
Evanston, IL 60202

From: [Kathleen Nummerdor](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:45:27 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Kathleen Nummerdor
236 W Vfw Rd
Cheboygan, MI 49721

From: [amyutto](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:45:59 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
amyutto
421 48th St
Oakland, CA 94609

From: [Irene Radke](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:46:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Irene Radke

150 Hideaway Ln

Mooresville, NC 28117

From: [G. Thomas Hoemig](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:46:21 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

G. Thomas Hoemig
1220 Sanchez St
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: [David Stanley](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:46:30 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

David Stanley
1505 Glenshire Dr
Champaign, IL 61822

From: [paul dressler](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:46:42 PM

Dear NRC Commissioner NRC Commissioners and Staff,

Dear NRC Commissioners and Staff

I oppose NRC's proposed expansion of Categorical Exclusions (exemptions) (published 5-7-21). As another already mentioned below I agree with those statements

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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
paul dressler

7 arborridge drive
forked river, NJ 08731

From: [Dawn Kosec](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:46:48 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Dawn Kosec

1895 Innwood Drive

Austintown, OH 44515

From: [Alice Bloch](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:46:54 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Alice Bloch

7228 Shaftesbury Ave

Saint Louis, MO 63130

From: [Hillary Colby](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:47:30 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Hillary Colby
1479 Sedona Ave
Aurora, IL 60504

From: [Richard Han](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:47:32 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Richard Han

16 Eastbury Court

Ann Arbor, MI 48105

From: [James Olson-Lee](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:48:32 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

James Olson-Lee
PO Box 22183
Sacramento, CA 95822

From: [Janet-Marie Myers](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:48:44 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Janet-Marie Myers
55 W Livingston Ave
Columbus, OH 43215
614-914-8029

From: [April Parkins](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:49:06 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
April Parkins
4285 Gilbert St
Oakland, CA 94611

From: [Craig Clark](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:49:12 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Craig Clark

412 lafayete ave

CLIFFSIDE PARK, NJ 07010

From: [Janice Bailey](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:49:14 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Janice Bailey

1 Columbus Place

New York, NY 10019

From: [Martha Graham-Waldon](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:49:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Martha Graham-Waldon
9501 E Zayante Rd
Felton, CA 95018

From: [Richard Coveny](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:49:24 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Richard Coveny
PO Box 283
Elfers, FL 34680

From: [Rob mccue](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:49:36 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Rob mccue

2803 Grace street

Columbia, SC 29201

From: [Nalei Kahakalau](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:50:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Nalei Kahakalau
PO Box 1764
Honokaa, HI 96727

From: [Carolyn Haupt](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:50:49 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Carolyn Haupt

3243 Gunston Rd

Alexandria, VA 22302

From: [Joshua Angelus](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:50:50 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Joshua Angelus

69 Hillside Avenue

Waterbury, CT 06710

From: [Yolanda Stern Broad PhD](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:51:17 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. 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 DO WANT more, not less, input on storage and transport cask designs.

I DO 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 deliberately 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Yolanda Stern Broad PhD
215 N 4th St
Indiana, PA 15701

From: [Diane Vandiver](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:51:20 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Diane Vandiver
530 Princeton Dr
Bolingbrook, IL 60440

From: [nancy king](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:51:39 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

nancy king
1224 Vallecita Dr
Santa Fe, NM 87501

From: [Fayette Krause](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:51:40 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Fayette Krause

2315 Madrona St

Port Townsend, WA 98368

From: [Mark Skaret](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:51:40 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Mark Skaret

153 Riverton Rd

Riverton, CT 06065

From: [Craig Simpson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:51:42 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Craig Simpson

425 Gallivan Blvd

Dorchester, MA 02124

From: [David Broadwater](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:52:06 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
David Broadwater
6604 Portola Rd
Atascadero, CA 93422

From: [John Moon](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:52:43 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
John Moon
1612 York Way
Sparks, NV 89431

From: [Cathy Zucker](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:53:20 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Cathy Zucker

485 Oakland St

Lake Orion, MI 48362

From: [Louise E Reardon](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:53:20 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Louise E Reardon
1843 Fritz Ln
Lancaster, PA 17602

From: [Kevin Schader](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:53:20 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Kevin Schader

421 Camelback Rd

Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

From: [Noah Haydon](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:53:22 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Noah Haydon
405 91st St
Daly City, CA 94015

From: [Lorraine Hartmann](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:53:22 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Lorraine Hartmann
10627 Durland Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98125

From: [Timothy Nero](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:53:26 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Timothy Nero
13A. Cur Trail
Glorieta, NM 87535

From: [Steve White](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:53:29 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Steve White

115 S

Anaheim, CA 92805

From: [Leslie Lomas](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:53:49 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Leslie Lomas
2290 Emerald Rd
Boulder, CO 80304

From: [Dick Bennett](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:53:54 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Dick Bennett

2582 N Jimmie Ave

Fayetteville, AR 72703

From: [Jon Bazinet](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:53:54 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Jon Bazinet
256 Honeydew Dr
Vallejo, CA 94591

From: [Connie & Mike Kline](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:53:58 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. 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.

Sincerely,
Connie & Michael Kline

Sincerely,
Connie & Mike Kline
Willoughby Hills, OH 44094

From: [O Lewis](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:54:02 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

O Lewis

PO Box 881075

Los Angeles, CA 90009

From: [Carol Jurczewski](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:54:04 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Carol Jurczewski
452 Shenstone Rd
Riverside, IL 60546

From: [Connie & Mike Kline](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:54:11 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. 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.

Sincerely,
Connie & Michael Kline

Sincerely,
Connie & Mike Kline
Willoughby Hills, OH 44094

From: [Tim Linerud](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:54:13 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Tim Linerud
325 Middle Road
Belmont, CA 94002

From: [Gerald Stein](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:54:14 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Gerald Stein

1813 NW 35th Way

Gainesville, FL 32605

From: [Duncan Brown](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:54:24 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Duncan Brown
8122 E Sundew Dr
Tucson, AZ 85710

From: [Susan P. Walp](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:54:25 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Susan P. Walp
1234 El Mirador Dr
Pasadena, CA 91103

From: [Joel Eisenkramer](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:54:27 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Joel Eisenkramer
Brattleboro, VT

From: [Stephen Diamond](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:54:31 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Stephen Diamond
8 McCurdy Rd
Old Lyme, CT 06371

From: [Kurt Cruger](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:54:37 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Kurt Cruger
774 Roswell Ave
Long Beach, CA 90804

From: [James R Monroe](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:54:50 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

James R Monroe
5521 Michigan Blvd
Concord, CA 94521

From: [Gregory Pais](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:55:02 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Gregory Pais

206 Aspen Meadows Rd

Nederland, CO 80466

From: [Tony Tsang](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:55:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Tony Tsang
2055 W 10th St
Brooklyn, NY 11223

From: [Maria Mollenkopf](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:55:17 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Maria Mollenkopf

3300 Well Branch Pkwy #6210

Austin, TX 78728

From: [Linda Paleias](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:55:36 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Linda Paleias

3300 ne36 street

Fort Lauderdale, FL 33308

From: [Brian Duncan](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:55:41 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Brian Duncan
7307 21st Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98117

From: [William Welkowitz](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:55:41 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

William Welkowitz
1600 S. Eads St., Apt. 526N
Arlington, VA 22202

From: [Thomas Crothers](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:55:45 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Thomas Crothers
679 Halifax Dr
Lexington, KY 40503

From: [Carolyn Young](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:55:47 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Carolyn Young
14 N San Francisco St
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

From: [Patricia Claytor](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:55:57 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Patricia Claytor
10510 Conway Rd
Saint Louis, MO 63131

From: [Silvia Hall](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:56:12 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Silvia Hall
349 NE 31st St
Boca Raton, FL 33431

From: [shirley jenkins](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:56:41 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

shirley jenkins

212 Mill Stream Way
Williamsburg, VA 23185

From: [Chris Lindberg](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:56:52 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Chris Lindberg
29818 Yorkton Rd
Murrieta, CA 92563

From: [Gudrun Dennis](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:57:19 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Gudrun Dennis
5912 NW 26th St
Gainesville, FL 32653

From: [Twyla Meyer](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:57:53 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Twyla Meyer
244 Hickory Ave.
Pomona, CA 91767

From: [Gregory Rosasco](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:58:00 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Gregory Rosasco
5380 Peacock Dr
Holiday, FL 34690

From: [Eileen Chieco](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:58:01 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Eileen Chieco
4429 Webster St
Oakland, CA 94609

From: [Jeanne Fox](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:58:18 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fox

227 New York Avenue
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

From: [Hunter Wallof](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:58:24 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Hunter Wallof

17250 Monte Grande Dr

Soulsbyville, CA 95372

From: [Sandra Franz](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:58:26 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Sandra Franz

1130 W Cornelia Ave Apt I

Chicago, IL 60657

From: [Brian Barrett](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:58:31 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Brian Barrett
441 Lotus Ln
Glenview, IL 60025

From: [casee maxfield](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:58:32 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

casee maxfield

1737 N Sycamore Ave

Los Angeles, CA 90028

From: [Donald Clark](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:58:35 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Donald Clark

PO Box 220

Pleasant Hill, TN 38578

From: [George Sidoti](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:58:39 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
George Sidoti
9 Lipson Court
East Northport, NY 11731

From: [Ernest Paviour](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:58:51 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Ernest Paviour
7998 Lookout Knob
Victor, NY 14564

From: [Cynthia Papermaster](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:59:05 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Cynthia Papermaster
1907 McGee Ave
Berkeley, CA 94703

From: [M Port](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:59:08 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

M Port

8178 Duomo Cir

Boynton Beach, FL 33472

From: [Rob Jursa](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:59:23 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Rob Jursa

Liesingtalstrasse 117

Breitenfurt, AE 00000

From: [Eric West](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:59:32 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Eric West
3943 S Peninsula Dr
Port Orange, FL 32127

From: [Carol Jackson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:59:37 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Carol Jackson

337 West 71 Street, Apt.5

New York, NY 10023

646-413-0134

From: [Bret Polish](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:59:40 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Bret Polish

18111 Topham St

Tarzana, CA 91335

From: [Laurie Tsitsivas](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:00:04 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Laurie Tsitsivas
33586 Via Lagos
Dana Point, CA 92629

From: [Steve Roddy](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:00:04 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Steve Roddy

619 7th Ave

San Francisco, CA 94118

From: [Elizabeth MacKelvie](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:00:17 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Elizabeth MacKelvie
1954 Palisades Dr
Appleton, WI 54915

From: [Gene Kostruba](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:00:22 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.

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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Gene Kostruba

468 Sierra Vista Ave Apt 15

Mountain View, CA 94043

From: [Johnny Hall](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:00:26 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Johnny Hall
124 Justice Br
Dana, KY 41615

From: [frank belcastro](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:00:28 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

frank belcastro

285 north grandview avenue

dubuque, IA 52001

From: [Peter Coleman](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:00:40 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Peter Coleman

3456 County Highway 35

Schenectady, NY 12155

From: [alvaro garza](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:00:41 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

alvaro garza

1721 morning dove circle

modesto, CA 95354

From: [Duncan Brown](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:00:42 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Duncan Brown
8122 E Sundew Dr
Tucson, AZ 85710

From: [Steven and Susan Mayes](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:00:58 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Steven and Susan Mayes
16 Mesa Pino
Santa Fe, NM 87508

From: [Bob Moyer](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:01:04 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Bob Moyer

713 Scenic Dr

Harleysville, PA 19438

From: [Laura Sholtz](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:02:01 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Laura Sholtz
384 Fogler Rd
Exeter, ME 04435

From: [Shakayla Thomas](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:02:34 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Shakayla Thomas
407 S Taper Ave
Compton, CA 90220

From: [Melissa Bird](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:02:54 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Melissa Bird
111 Depot Rd
Harwich, MA 02645

From: [Vinnedge Lawrence](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:03:30 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Vinnedge Lawrence
299 Saddleback Rd
West Baldwin, ME 04091

From: [David Monsees](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:03:33 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
David Monsees
1347 W Parkhill Dr
Boise, ID 83703

From: [Martha Martin](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:03:45 PM

Dear NRC Commissioner NRC Commissioners and Staff,

Dear NRC Commissioners and Staff:

I strongly 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Martha Martin

40 Kunihi Ln Apt 226

Kahului, HI 96732

From: [Mel Fish](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:04:48 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Mel Fish

270 SW Wakonda Beach Rd

Waldport, OR 97394

From: [Grace Neff](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:05:40 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Grace Neff
800 28th Ave SE
Albany, OR 97322

From: [Loretta Kerns](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:05:41 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Loretta Kerns
105 Brent Pl
Cortland, OH 44410

From: [Carole Ivy](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:05:54 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Carole Ivy
674 E Harrison Rd
Alma, MI 48801

From: [Tedd Ward Jr.](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:06:05 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Tedd Ward Jr.

10520 Ogden St

Petersburg, IL 62675

From: [Neal Madnick](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:06:17 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Neal Madnick
16910 33rd Ave
Flushing, NY 11358

From: [Stephen Smith](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:06:36 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Stephen Smith
708 14th Ave
Bethlehem, PA 18018

From: [Leigh Begalske](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:06:59 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Leigh Begalske
1823 Fiesta Ln
Green Bay, WI 54302

From: [Kathleen Mireault](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:07:03 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Kathleen Mireault
32 Oakview Ter
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130

From: [Judith Anderson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:07:06 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Judith Anderson
6493 Edna Rd
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

From: [F. Carlene Reuscher](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:07:08 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

F. Carlene Reuscher
1866 Kinglet Ct
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

From: [Barbara Scavezze](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:07:27 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Barbara Scavezze
3008 Amhurst Ct SE
Olympia, WA 98501

From: [Marvin J Ward](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:07:44 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Marvin J Ward

15 Cottage St Apt 413
Easthampton, MA 01027

From: [Katrina and William Dresbach](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:08:04 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Katrina and William Dresbach
134 Latimer. Ct. P.O.Bx 2066
Sheffield Lake, Oh, OH 44054

From: [Joseph Naidnur](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:08:06 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Joseph Naidnur
213 W Stonegate Rd
Peoria, IL 61614

From: [Laurence Skirvin](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:08:07 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Laurence Skirvin

1507 Syble Dr

Villa Rica, GA 30180

From: [Alexandra Lamb](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:08:13 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Alexandra Lamb
1402 G Street
Eureka, CA 95501

From: [Bob Lichtenbert](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:08:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Bob Lichtenbert
5307 W Nelson St
Chicago, IL 60641

From: [garry star](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:08:45 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

garry star

3084 Chancery Pl

Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

From: [joan langue](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:08:45 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
joan langue
334 Bowery
New York, NY 10012

From: [John Wozniak](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:09:02 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

John Wozniak

PO Box 1750

Mendocino, CA 95460

From: [Carlos Arnold](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:09:15 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Carlos Arnold

499 Fair Oaks Dr

Santa Maria, CA 93455

From: [Elena Rumiantseva](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:09:20 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Elena Rumiantseva
8051 20th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

From: [Kelly Baraka](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:09:23 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Kelly Baraka

4012 Lambert Rd

El Sobrante, CA 94803

From: [michael earney](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:09:24 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
michael earney
PO Box 627
Utopia, TX 78884

From: [Colleen Lobel](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:09:46 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Colleen Lobel
8111 Kenova St
San Diego, CA 92126

From: [Jude Maglione](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:09:48 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Jude Maglione
10 Moreview Dr
Asheville, NC 28803

From: [Carol Becker](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:09:55 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Carol Becker

14257 Roblar Place

Sherman Oaks, CA 91423

From: [Monique Edwards](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:10:06 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Monique Edwards
12163 N Seasons Loop
Oro Valley, AZ 85755

From: [Nancy Simon](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:11:14 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Nancy Simon
Santa Barbara, CA

From: [Donald Rhoads](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:11:38 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Donald Rhoads

1000 W Williams Rd

Bloomington, IN 47404

From: [Steven G. Kellman](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:11:52 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Steven G. Kellman

302 Fawn Dr

Shavano Park, TX 78231

From: [J. Beverly](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:12:01 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.

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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
J. Beverly
803 Shurts St
Urbana, IL 61801

From: [Julie Sanford](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:12:27 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Julie Sanford
15418 Gault St
Van Nuys, CA 91406

From: [Leona Klerer](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:12:57 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Leona Klerer

71 Strawberry Hill Ave Apt 907

Stamford, CT 06902

From: [Stephen Shearer](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:12:58 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Stephen Shearer

475 Dolores St. #6

San Francisco, CA 94110

From: [Marie Wakefield](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:13:17 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Marie Wakefield
3054 Highway 20
Newport, OR 97365

From: [Carlos Nunez](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:13:17 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Carlos Nunez
18009 Victory Blvd
Reseda, CA 91335

From: [Achala Devi](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:13:19 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Achala Devi

1252 31st St

Port Townsend, WA 98368

From: [Sara Diaz](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:13:20 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Sara Diaz

214 Cleveland Ave

Long Branch, NJ 07740

From: [Rev. Glen Thamert](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:13:29 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Rev. Glen Thamert

pob 368

jemez springs, NM 87025

From: [Kathryn Christian](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:13:57 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Kathryn Christian
960 White Ave
Grand Junction, CO 81501

From: [Karen Spradlin](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:13:59 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Karen Spradlin

307 Wilson Dr SW

Jacksonville, AL 36265

From: [Steven Vogel](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:14:21 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Steven Vogel

449 Hampton Ct

Falls Church, VA 22046

From: [Mary S Reed](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:14:42 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Mary S Reed

1135 Hampshire Hollow Rd

Poultney, VT 05764

From: [Kermit Cuff](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:15:01 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Kermit Cuff

338 Mariposa Ave

Mountain View, CA 94041

From: [David Stanley](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:15:03 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

David Stanley
1505 Glenshire Dr
Champaign, IL 61822

From: [Stephanie C. Fox](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:15:10 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Stephanie C. Fox
14 Wyndcliffe Park
Bloomfield, CT 06002

From: [Fritzi Cohen](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:15:21 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Fritzi Cohen
PO Box 82
Nahcotta, WA 98637

From: [Laura Silverman](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:16:28 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Laura Silverman
30 Rose Rd
West Nyack, NY 10994

From: [Pam McMahon](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:16:49 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Pam McMahon
925 McEntire Rd
Tryon, NC 28782

From: [Thom Lufkin](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:17:36 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Thom Lufkin

212 21st Ave SE

Olympia, WA 98501

From: [Karen Biesanz](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:18:17 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Karen Biesanz

215 Watauga Ave

Corning, NY 14830

From: [Bonnie Gorman RN](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:18:48 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Bonnie Gorman RN
222 Rock Island Rd
Quincy, MA 02169

From: [Elizabeth Croom](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:20:50 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Croom
515 Nerinx Road
Nerinx, KY 40049

From: [Tammy King](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:20:58 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Tammy King
29 Acadia Road
Gardner, MA 01440

From: [David Audette](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:21:08 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

David Audette

33100 Freds Row Ln

Saint Helens, OR 97051

From: [Jon Nadle](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:21:30 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Jon Nadle
858 Gladys Ave
Pittsburgh, PA 15216

From: [Thomas Turner](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:21:45 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Thomas Turner
457 E Washington Ave
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

From: [E P](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:21:58 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

E P

PO Box 178

Talmage, CA 95481

From: [Catherine Jones](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:22:11 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Catherine Jones

100 Dreiser Loop Apt 3H

Bronx, NY 10475

From: [Bob Parker](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:23:14 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.

- * 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Bob Parker
11514 Chautauqua
Brecksville, OH 44141
216-555-1212

From: [David Lees](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:23:57 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
David Lees
41 Topsfield rd
Ipswich, MA 01938

From: [Eileen Prefontaine](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:24:07 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Eileen Prefontaine
6 Leonard St
Hopkinton, MA 01748

From: [Edward Jasiewicz](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:24:08 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Edward Jasiewicz
411 Lloyd St
Pittsburgh, PA 15208

From: [Manuel Bermudez](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:24:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Manuel Bermudez

W232S7390 Woodland Ln

Big Bend, WI 53103

From: [Sharon Tee](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:24:24 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Sharon Tee
315 Eastern Street
New Haven, CT 06513

From: [Peter Reimer](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:25:04 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Peter Reimer

1771 Highland Blvd

Hayward, CA 94542

From: [Sandra Marr](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:25:48 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Sandra Marr

275 N Belden Hill Dr

Guilford, VT 05301

From: [Martha Vinick](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:25:57 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Martha Vinick

5551 Dunrobin Dr Unit 4301

Sarasota, FL 34239

From: [Barbara poland](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:27:36 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Barbara poland
4802 Glenwood Ave
La Crescenta, CA 91214

From: [David BUTLER](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:27:43 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
David BUTLER
35 Asbury Ln
Hermitage, TN 37076

From: [Barbara Swyden](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:27:52 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Barbara Swyden

720 Garnet Drive Northeast

Rio Rancho, NM 87124

From: [Zara Zsido](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:28:27 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Zara Zsido
Union Park Street
Boston, MA 02118

From: [Teresa Gingras](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:28:27 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Teresa Gingras

422 W Frederick Ave

Lansing, MI 48906

From: [Karen Peterson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:29:17 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Karen Peterson
735 York Ct
Northbrook, IL 60062

From: [katherine dander](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:29:51 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
katherine dander
2 Hawthorne Pl
Boston, MA 02114

From: [M Langelan](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:29:58 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

M Langelan

7215 Chestnut St

Chevy Chase, MD 20815

From: [Julian Yerena Jr](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:30:08 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Julian Yerena Jr
13571 E Third St
Parlier, CA 93648

From: [Gloria Diggle](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:30:38 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Gloria Diggle

637 SW Magnolia Ln

Fort White, FL 32038

From: [Robert Burk,](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:32:23 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Robert Burk,

611 Woodruff Ave

Los Angeles, CA 90024

From: [Marian Cruz](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:33:05 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Marian Cruz
585 Lanini Dr
Hollister, CA 95023

From: [Jared Cornelia](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:33:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Jared Cornelia
125 Denn Pl
Wilmington, DE 19804

From: [Carol Book](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:33:17 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Carol Book
27 Mill St
York, PA 17406

From: [Henry Mobley](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:33:19 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Henry Mobley

5325 Alishire Ct

Virginia Beach, VA 23464

From: [Paula Neville](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:34:25 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Paula Neville

277 Pepperidge Drive

Rochester, NY 14626

From: [Ellen Atkinson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:34:31 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Ellen Atkinson

1117 Stratford Rd

Lynchburg, VA 24502

From: [robert oberdorf](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:35:02 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

robert oberdorf

58 Ann Lee Lane

tamarac, FL 33319

From: [Don W](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:35:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Don W

101

Eureka, CA 95503

From: [Mary Shaughnessy](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:35:31 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Mary Shaughnessy
Indianapolis, IN 46217

From: [Mary Shaughnessy](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:35:32 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Mary Shaughnessy
Indianapolis, IN 46217

From: [Cynthia Cunningham](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:35:34 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Cynthia Cunningham
2435 Glenwood Drive
Boulder, CO 80304

From: [Elizabeth Patten](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:35:49 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Patten
65 Staniels Rd
Chichester, NH 03258

From: [Joyce Barringer](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:35:54 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Joyce Barringer
1 Russell St Unit 401
Cambridge, MA 02140

From: [Janet McCalister](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:36:04 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Janet McCalister
110 Snead Rd
Winston Salem, NC 27103

From: [David Trione](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:36:14 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

David Trione

431 33rd Pl

Philomath, OR 97370

From: [Scott Teel](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:36:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Scott Teel

710 N Cayuga St Apt 3

Ithaca, NY 14850

From: [Susan Detato](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:36:23 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Susan Detato

564 Evansville Rd

Brownington, VT 05860

From: [Rich Goldberg](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:36:32 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Rich Goldberg
118 Highland Ave
Penngrove, CA 94951

From: [Diane Mitchell](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:36:38 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Diane Mitchell
48429 joy rd
Canton, MI 48187

From: [Nathan Vogel](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:37:01 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Nathan Vogel

49 Alpine Ter

San Francisco, CA 94177

From: [karen_stickney](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:37:08 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
karen stickney
27 Baril St
Lewiston, ME 04240

From: [Jeff Kiralis](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:37:13 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Jeff Kiralis

410 Potato Hill Rd

Fairlee, VT 05045

From: [John Papandrea](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:37:18 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

John Papandrea

110 W 90th St

New York, NY 10024

From: [Anne Martinez](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:37:36 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Anne Martinez
Bd Lord Duveen
Marseille, HI 13008

From: [Judith Beaver](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:38:13 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Judith Beaver

500 W. Hendrickson Rd. Stop 5027

Sequim, WA 98382

From: [Phyllis Edinberg](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:38:14 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Phyllis Edinberg
57 Paradox Dr
Worcester, MA 01602

From: [Gloria Picchetti](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:38:18 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Gloria Picchetti
3920 N Clark St
Chicago, IL 60613

From: [Sharon Fasnacht](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:39:17 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Sharon Fasnacht

4006 113th Ave SW

Olympia, WA 98512

From: [Nicholas Feda](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:39:58 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Nicholas Feda
101 Charlotte Court
Cary, IL 60013

From: [James Moran](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:40:34 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

James Moran

8331 W Marlette Ave

Glendale, AZ 85305

From: [tara wheeler](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:40:56 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

tara wheeler

2915 Hunter Mill Rd

Oakton, VA 22124

111-234-5789

From: [Linda Worsley](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:41:04 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Linda Worsley

685 Old Hickory Lane

Chatham, AR 24531

From: [Bruce Denny](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:41:26 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Bruce Denny
411 W 4th St
Shawano, WI 54166

From: [Annie Wilson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:41:28 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Annie Wilson
225 Broadway
New York, NY 10007

From: [Holly Kukkonen](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:41:32 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Holly Kukkonen
1607 Burns Ave
Iowa City, IA 52240

From: [Deborah Voves](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:42:09 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Deborah Voves
13231 Mountain Pl.
Anchorage, AK 99516

From: [Richard McGonagle](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:42:30 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Richard McGonagle
PO Box 336
Hollis Center, ME 04042

From: [Marilyn Hill](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:42:31 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Marilyn Hill
PO Box 160277
Big Sky, MT 59716

From: [Brenda Hartman](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:42:32 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Brenda Hartman

240 Spies Church Rd Lot 124

Reading, PA 19606

From: [Cheryl Carnahan](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:42:36 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Cheryl Carnahan

328 Squareview Ln

Rochester, NY 14626

From: [Jessica Fielden MD](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:43:20 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Jessica Fielden MD
6620 Woodland Place
Oakland, CA 94611

From: [Pat Magrath](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:43:31 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Pat Magrath

1905 N Vallejo Way

Upland, CA 91784

From: [Robyn Dibble](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:43:33 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Robyn Dibble

164 Route 27 Apt 22

Raymond, NH 03077

From: [Mary Yunker](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:43:35 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Mary Yunker

422 S Logsdon Pkwy

Radcliff, KY 40160

From: [Becky Daiss](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:43:52 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Becky Daiss

1276 N Wayne St

Arlington, VA 22201

From: [Carol Wiley](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:43:56 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Carol Wiley

15457 Eto Camino Rd

Victorville, CA 92394

From: [Kathy Durrum](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:43:57 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Kathy Durrum
1818 S Fundy Way
Aurora, CO 80017

From: [Lee Witkowski](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:44:33 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Lee Witkowski
1359 State Street
LEMONT, IL 60439

From: [Mary Randall](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:44:41 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Mary Randall
PO Box 20871
Boulder, CO 80308

From: [Daniel Hawley](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:44:42 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Daniel Hawley
PO Box 49
Ketchum, ID 83340

From: [Joseph Gulas](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:45:08 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Joseph Gulas
12 Patty Ann Ter
Derby, CT 06418

From: [Carl May](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:45:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Carl May
Moss Beach, CA

From: [David A. Smith](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:45:29 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

David A. Smith

59 harvey

irvnine, CA 92617

From: [Wendy Larson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:46:28 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Wendy Larson

5938 S Riveridge Ln

Portland, OR 97239

From: [Yefim Maizel](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:46:50 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Yefim Maizel

5025 Diamond Heights Blvd

San Francisco, CA 94131

From: [William McGoldrick](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:46:56 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

William McGoldrick
2754 Rangewood Dr NE
Atlanta, GA 30345

From: [Chris Kermiet](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:47:12 PM

Dear NRC Commissioner NRC Commissioners and Staff,

Dear NRC Commissioners and Staff:

I object to and 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Chris Kermiet
2267 Hudson St
Denver, CO 80207

From: [J.A. Perry](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:47:45 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

J.A. Perry
24 Ridge Ave
Asheville, NC 28803

From: [Paul Kalka](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:47:55 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Paul Kalka

4397 Brady Hill Rd

Binghamton, NY 13903

From: [Alison Jaskiewicz](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:48:45 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Alison Jaskiewicz
576 Jackson Rd
Mason, NH 03048

From: [Jeremy Spencer](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:48:45 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Jeremy Spencer
551 Arguello Blvd
Pacifica, CA 94044

From: [Coral Shaffer](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:49:13 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Coral Shaffer

1616A Browne Ave

Yakima, WA 98902

From: [Michael Ziegler](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:49:25 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Michael Ziegler
General Delivery
Astoria, OR 97103
562-980-2858

From: [Ann Joseph](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:49:29 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Ann Joseph

10137 S Avenue M # 1

Chicago, IL 60617

From: [Joshua Seff](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:49:33 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Joshua Seff

9508 George Washington Dr

McKinney, TX 75072

From: [Robin Kory](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:49:37 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Robin Kory

110 Trout Ave

Colorado Springs, CO 80906

From: [Sue Wilkin](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:49:39 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Sue Wilkin

6724 E Manzanita Dr

Kingman, AZ 86401

From: [CARLA DAVIS](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:49:46 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

CARLA DAVIS
777 MeadowSweet Dr
Corte Madera, CA 94925

From: [Michele Temple](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:50:07 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Michele Temple
4827 41st St
Sunnyside, NY 11104

From: [Carol Wiley](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:50:19 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Carol Wiley

15457 Eto Camino Rd

Victorville, CA 92394

From: [Pat Marino](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:50:22 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Pat Marino

41 Lemoyne Ln

Johns Island, SC 29455

From: [Melvin Armolt](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:50:24 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Melvin Armolt

5229 Applecross Ave
Chambersburg, PA 17202

From: [John Comella](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:50:25 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

John Comella

1900 John F Kennedy Blvd Apt 1624

Philadelphia, PA 19103

From: [Thomas Hernandez](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:50:48 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Thomas Hernandez
19200 Rising Sun Rd
Corona, CA 92881

From: [Janet H.](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:51:04 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Janet H.

93619 E Blue Bird Ln
North Bend, OR 97459

From: [Dan Doepper](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:51:07 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Dan Doepper

4253 S Township Road 151

Tiffin, OH 44883

From: [Jerrold Allen](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:51:37 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Jerrold Allen
7135 Noland Rd
Falls Church, VA 22042

From: [steven zimmerman](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:51:45 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

steven zimmerman

249 S Tulpehocken St

Pine Grove, PA 17963

From: [Charles J Comer](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:51:45 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Charles J Comer

323 Bauserman Rd

MOUNT JACKSON, VA 22842

From: [Patricia Barile](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:52:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Patricia Barile

1227 Foothill St

Redwood City, CA 94061

From: [MaryAnne Glazar](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:52:27 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

MaryAnne Glazar
968 Addison St
Berkeley, CA 94710

From: [Donna Nina](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:53:26 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Donna Nina

139 W Englewood Ave Apt 6A

Teaneck, NJ 07666

From: [Joy Baker](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:53:34 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Joy Baker
250 Vallejo St
Petaluma, CA 94952

From: [C Wilson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:54:46 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

C Wilson

1177 EDGEBROOK DR
WINSTON SALEM, NC 27106

From: [John Jackson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:54:56 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
John Jackson
1306 Metcalf Rd
Bonifay, FL 32425

From: [Lois Klepin](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:54:57 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Lois Klepin

147 E Palomar St

Chula Vista, CA 91911

From: [David Osterhoudt](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:55:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

David Osterhoudt

21022 Los Alisos Blvd., Apt. 214

Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688

From: [Sarah Stewart](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:55:24 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Sarah Stewart

85 Garfield Street

Watertown, MA 02472

From: [Phyllis Chavez](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:56:14 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Phyllis Chavez

2112 Ocean Park Blvd Apt 5

Santa Monica, CA 90405

From: [Diana Saxon](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:56:18 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Diana Saxon

408 Market St NE Apt 23

Salem, OR 97301

From: [Alan Lawrence](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:57:03 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Alan Lawrence

6901 N. Haight Ave.

Portland, OR 97217

From: [Sharon Hafner](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:57:05 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Sharon Hafner

3800 Mitchell Road

Eureka, CA 95503

From: [Dolores Parra](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:57:12 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Dolores Parra

3019 Banyan Hill Ln
Land O Lakes, FL 34639

From: [Linda Beach](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:57:15 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Linda Beach

31 Mountain View Ave

Albany, NY 12205

From: [Jeff Thayer](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:57:24 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Jeff Thayer

3073 Jemez Dr

San Diego, CA 92117

From: [Cornelia Teed](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:57:38 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Cornelia Teed

1201 13th St Unit 201

Bellingham, WA 98225

From: [William Persky](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:57:45 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

William Persky
2528 Fir St SE
Olympia, WA 98501

From: [Richard Fairfield](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:58:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Richard Fairfield

123 Noaddress Santa Rosa CA

Santa Rosa, CA 95407

From: [James Freeberg](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:58:30 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
James Freeberg
823 Blackberry Ln
Ashland, OR 97520

From: [Michelle Gale](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:58:42 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Michelle Gale

5039 Pebblebrook Way

Coconut Creek, FL 33073

From: [Jewell Batway](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:59:19 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Jewell Batway

11301 E Jupiter Dr

Apache Junction, AZ 85120

From: [Tim Miller](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:59:21 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Tim Miller

202 Moon Mountain Rd

Sonoma, CA 95476

From: [Jon Cecil](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:59:34 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Jon Cecil

4840 Bryn Mawr Ct Apt 4

Anchorage, AK 99508

From: [M. Lehman](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:59:35 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

M. Lehman

33 Grattan St

Chicopee, MA 01020

413-555-1212

From: [Richard Longley](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:59:39 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Richard Longley
719 SW Chiefland Ln
Fort White, FL 32038

From: [Kelly DeVine](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:59:50 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Kelly DeVine

119 Jayne Avenue

Port Jefferson, NY 11777

From: [NANCY TATE](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:02:45 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.

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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
NANCY TATE
PO Box 344
Riegelsville, PA 18077

From: [Betty Brooks](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:03:00 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Betty Brooks
123 S 2nd Ave.
Hailey, ID 83333

From: [Georgia Braithwaite](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:04:43 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Georgia Braithwaite
2145 S Hogan Ln
Cottonwood, AZ 86326

From: [Jason Dubow](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:04:47 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Jason Dubow
Baltimore, MD

From: [Kathleen Eaton](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:04:48 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Kathleen Eaton

1035 Schagrin Drive

Middletown, DE 19709

From: [Jeff Dorer](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:05:10 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Jeff Dorer

510 S Coronado St

Los Angeles, CA 90057

From: [Jarrett Cloud](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:05:10 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Jarrett Cloud
260 Tabor Rd
Morris Plains, NJ 07950

From: [Patricia Blackwell-Marchant](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:05:22 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Patricia Blackwell-Marchant
5737 Medallion Ct
Castro Valley, CA 94552

From: [Valerie Fannin](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:05:23 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Valerie Fannin
2601 Nord Ave
Chico, CA 95973

From: [Nancy Crider](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:05:27 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Nancy Crider
481 Main St. North
Woodbury, CT 06798

From: Catherine Croom
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:06:48 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Catherine Croom
30412 Heimer Cv
Bulverde, TX 78163

From: [Charles Tribbey](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:06:52 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Charles Tribbey

57 La Gaviota

Pismo Beach, CA 93449

From: [Allan Widmeyer](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:06:53 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Allan Widmeyer
558 Oak Hill Circle
Ashland, OR 97520

From: [Annie McCien](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:07:24 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Annie McCien
1825 Fairmount ave s
Salem, OR 97302

From: [Jacoba Dolloff](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:07:36 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Jacoba Dolloff
4545 Taft Ave
La Mesa, CA 91941

From: [Robert Gold](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:08:10 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Robert Gold

11852 Lion Cub Ln

Charlotte, NC 28273

From: [Mike Abler](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:08:12 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Mike Abler

99 Frederick St

Santa Cruz, CA 95062

From: [Nancy Ellingham](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:08:13 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Nancy Ellingham
9106 Fortuna Dr
Mercer Island, WA 98040

From: [Edna Mullen](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:09:53 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Edna Mullen

1272 Richland Avenue
Saint Charles, MN 55972

From: [Ray Hearne](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:10:32 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Ray Hearne

Leicester, NC 28748

From: [Ray Hearne](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:10:37 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Ray Hearne

Leicester, NC 28748

From: [Aloysius Wald](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:10:52 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Aloysius Wald
523 East Lincoln Avenue
Columbus, OH 43214

From: [Mike Carberry](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:11:06 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Mike Carberry
2029 Friendship St
Iowa City, IA 52245

From: [Marcy Gordon](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:11:08 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Marcy J. Gordon

Sincerely,
Marcy Gordon
1758 Dean Street
Brooklyn, NY 11233

From: [Sandy Sobanski](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:11:08 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Sandy Sobanski
140 E 2nd St
Brooklyn, NY 11218

From: [Brian Gibbons](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:11:18 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Brian Gibbons
19510 Lorain Rd
Cleveland, OH 44126

From: [Gavin Bornholtz](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:12:04 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Gavin Bornholtz

9090 Creekwood Lake Trl

Grand Blanc, MI 48439

From: [Doug Wingeier](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:12:23 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Doug Wingeier
266 Merrimon Ave
Asheville, NC 28801

From: [Beverly Janowitz-Price](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:12:27 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Beverly Janowitz-Price
3020 N 14th St
Phoenix, AZ 85014

From: [Allan Crawshaw](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:12:28 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Allan Crawshaw

1680 Richardson Street

Victoria, CA 90602

From: [Claudia Leff](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:13:18 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Claudia Leff

149 Highview St

Mamaroneck, NY 10543

From: [Miriam Baum](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:13:24 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Miriam Baum

6532 Peridot Ave

Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91701

From: [Julie Squire](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:13:39 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Julie Squire
6605 Claremont Ave
Raytown, MO 64133

From: [Judy Moran](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:14:16 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Judy Moran

6109 N Star Dr

Panama City, FL 32404

From: [Norman Lathrop](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:14:26 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Norman Lathrop
308 Pierce Ct
Bolingbrook, IL 60440

From: [Michael Essex](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:14:34 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Michael Essex

1481 Lakehills Dr

El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

From: [Debra Rehn](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:15:18 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Debra Rehn

5130 SE 30th Ave Apt 9

Portland, OR 97202

From: [Dawn Silver](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:15:30 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Dawn Silver

2919 W Balmoral Ave

Chicago, IL 60625

From: [Brian Kelly](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:15:45 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Brian Kelly

1670 Park Ave

San Bruno, CA 94066

From: [Jim McCallum](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:16:05 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Jim McCallum

709 Collingswood Dr

Fort collins, CO 80524

From: [David Carter](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:16:15 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
David Carter
PO Box 291
Hamilton, VA 20159

From: [David Hand](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:16:17 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

David Hand

7169 NE Hidden Cove Rd
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

From: [James Hamilton](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:16:19 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

James Hamilton

2412 Palos Verdes Dr W
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274

From: [Nick Berezansky](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:17:33 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Nick Berezansky

123 Washington Pl

Ridgewood, NJ 07450

From: [Brian Ainsley](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:17:46 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Brian Ainsley

1227 Pine Needle Ct

Altamonte Springs, FL 32714

From: [Josephine Girardin](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 5:18:18 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Josephine Girardin
27 Reilly St
West Islip, NY 11795