

<b>As of:</b> 1/17/17 10:39 AM <b>Received:</b> January 13, 2017 <b>Status:</b> Pending_Post <b>Tracking No.</b> 1k1-8u57-c7v1 <b>Comments Due:</b> January 20, 2017 <b>Submission Type:</b> Web
---

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

**Docket:** NRC-2016-0179

Revisions to Transportation Safety Requirements and Compatibility with International Atomic Energy Agency Transportation Requirements

**Comment On:** NRC-2016-0179-0005

Revisions to Transportation Safety Requirements and Compatibility with International Atomic Energy Agency Transportation Standards; Notice of Issues Paper, Public Meeting, and Request for Comment

**Document:** NRC-2016-0179-DRAFT-0021

Comment on FR Doc # 2016-27944

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Jan Boudart

**Address:**

1132 W Lunt Ave  
Chicago, IL, 60626

**Email:** Janunaj@hotmail.com

---

## General Comment

From SSR-6 Section 304: "Consignors and carriers shall establish, in advance, arrangements for preparedness and response for emergencies that may occur during transport in accordance with [14] that are coordinated with respective off-site response organizations."

I read the QSA Global comment on this section. If compliance to SSR-6(304) is too onerous, then HLRW should not be transported on U.S. highways. QSA-G felt that preparation for any event that "may" occur is not realistic. I agree. But rather than the carrier and consignor trying to conform to the directive and finding themselves in non-compliance, the unacceptably dangerous situation should be precluded. If you can't keep the public safe from any event that "may" happen, then don't create the back story to that extremely dangerous event. It is not tolerable to subject the public to these dangers.