

From: [Janet Delaney](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Saturday, August 07, 2021 4:44:54 AM

Dear NRC Commissioner NRC Commissioners and Staff,

Dear NRC Commissioners and Staff:

I oppose NRC's proposed expansion of Categorical Exclusions (published 5-7-2021). It appears NRC wants to avoid legitimate controversy and generically exclude further public input on over a dozen important and controversial impacts from the nuclear power fuel chain. I do NOT want radioactive waste at any level released from nuclear control, to get into regular trash and commercial recycling, which could make everyday household items radioactive. This proposal could do that, despite decades of public opposition to "below regulatory concern" (BRC), "very low-level waste" (VLLW), and other generic exemptions from 10 CFR 20.2002 regulations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NRC has not "provide(d) a reasoned explanation for the change(s)," and each of them deserves its own environmental 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 Delaney
5406 Western Hills Dr.
Austin, TX 78731

From: [William Nusbaum](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Saturday, August 07, 2021 2:24:18 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,
William Nusbaum
2916 Gettysburg Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55426

From: [Joy Reese](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Saturday, August 07, 2021 5:36:50 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,
Joy Reese
339 W Barry Ave
Chicago, IL 60657
773-771-9417

From: [James Michael "Mike" Henderson](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Sunday, August 08, 2021 1:42:11 AM

Dear NRC Commissioner NRC Commissioners and Staff,

Dear NRC Commissioners and Staff:

I oppose NRC's proposed expansion of Categorical Exclusions (published 5-7-2021). It appears NRC wants to avoid legitimate controversy and generically exclude further public input on over a dozen important and controversial impacts from the nuclear power fuel chain. I do NOT want radioactive waste at any level released from nuclear control, to get into regular trash and commercial recycling, which could make everyday household items radioactive. This proposal could do that, despite decades of public opposition to “below regulatory concern” (BRC), “very low-level waste” (VLLW), and other generic exemptions from 10 CFR 20.2002 regulations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NRC has not "provide(d) a reasoned explanation for the change(s)," and each of them deserves its own environmental 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 Michael 'Mike' Henderson
55 Broad Street, Apt. 252
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

From: [Christine Powell](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Wednesday, August 11, 2021 7:29:45 AM

Dear NRC Commissioner NRC Commissioners and Staff,

Dear NRC Commissioners and Staff:

I oppose NRC's proposed expansion of Categorical Exclusions (published 5-7-2021). It appears NRC wants to avoid legitimate controversy and generically exclude further public input on over a dozen important and controversial impacts from the nuclear power fuel chain. I do NOT want radioactive waste at any level released from nuclear control, to get into regular trash and commercial recycling, which could make everyday household items radioactive. This proposal could do that, despite decades of public opposition to "below regulatory concern" (BRC), "very low-level waste" (VLLW), and other generic exemptions from 10 CFR 20.2002 regulations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NRC has not "provide(d) a reasoned explanation for the change(s)," and each of them deserves its own environmental 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 Powell
23701 Eli Ln
Gaithersburg, MD 20882

From: [Craig Warren](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Thursday, August 12, 2021 3:46:57 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,
Craig Warren
2159 Trower Ave
Napa, CA 94558

From: [Caryn Cowin](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Wednesday, August 18, 2021 12:29:42 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,

Caryn Cowin
4015 Scenic River Ln Apt 231
Bakersfield, CA 93308

From: [Caryn Cowin](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Wednesday, August 18, 2021 12:31:00 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,

Caryn Cowin
4015 Scenic River Ln Apt 231
Bakersfield, CA 93308

From: [Evan Hartman](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Wednesday, August 18, 2021 7:11:58 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,

Evan Hartman
607 N 11th St
Philadelphia, PA 19123

From: [Eric Meyer](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Saturday, August 21, 2021 10:35:52 AM

Dear NRC Commissioner NRC Commissioners and Staff,

Dear NRC Commissioners and Staff:

I oppose NRC's proposed expansion of Categorical Exclusions (published 5-7-2021). It appears NRC wants to avoid legitimate controversy and generically exclude further public input on over a dozen important and controversial impacts from the nuclear power fuel chain. I do NOT want radioactive waste at any level released from nuclear control, to get into regular trash and commercial recycling, which could make everyday household items radioactive. This proposal could do that, despite decades of public opposition to "below regulatory concern" (BRC), "very low-level waste" (VLLW), and other generic exemptions from 10 CFR 20.2002 regulations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NRC has not "provide(d) a reasoned explanation for the change(s)," and each of them deserves its own environmental 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 Meyer
PO Box 263
Bay City, TX 77404
830-833-0000

From: [Antonio Perez](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Friday, September 03, 2021 1:16:11 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,

Antonio Perez
136 Pennsylvania Ave Apt 2
San Diego, CA 92103

From: [Ed Perry](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Friday, September 03, 2021 4:29:48 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,

Ed Perry

1532 Rosewood Ter

New Braunfels, TX 78132

830-624-0840

From: [Ed Perry](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Friday, September 03, 2021 4:30:20 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,

Ed Perry

1532 Rosewood Ter

New Braunfels, TX 78132

From: [Felicia Bander](#)
To: [RulemakingComments Resource](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018-0300 No to Expanding Categorical Exclusions
Date: Sunday, September 05, 2021 6:51:23 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,

Felicia Bander

1300 Adams Ave Apt 15J

Costa Mesa, CA 92626