

## Holtec-CISFEISCEm Resource

---

**From:** Protecting NM From All Things Nuclear <protectnewmexico@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 31, 2018 2:22 AM  
**To:** Holtec-CISFEIS Resource  
**Subject:** [External\_Sender] Docket ID NRC-2018-0052 \_ NISG \_ PDF 38 of 72  
**Attachments:** NRC-2018-0052\_NISG-38.pdf; ATT00001.htm

Nuclear Regulatory Commissioners,

The Nuclear Issues Study Group (NISG) has mailed 3 boxes with a total of 5,112 Public Scoping Comments re: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052. We are emailing the corresponding digital copies (as PDFs 1-72) of the same, hand-signed individual Public Scoping Comments OPPOSING HOLTEC'S PROPOSED CISF AND RELATED TRANSPORT OF HLRW.

Box 1 contains PDFs 1-20.  
Box 2 contains PDFs 21-41.  
Box 3 contains PDFs 42-72.

**This email corresponds to Box 2: PDF 38.**

Leona Morgan, Co-Coordinator  
Nuclear Issues Study Group  
[protectnewmexico@gmail.com](mailto:protectnewmexico@gmail.com)  
+1 505 879 8547

**Federal Register Notice:** 83FR13802  
**Comment Number:** 3254

**Mail Envelope Properties** (F0EA2812-2634-4C72-B1BF-1A8A245359DF)

**Subject:** [External\_Sender] Docket ID NRC-2018-0052 \_ NISG \_ PDF 38 of 72  
**Sent Date:** 7/31/2018 2:22:01 AM  
**Received Date:** 7/31/2018 2:22:39 AM  
**From:** Protecting NM From All Things Nuclear

**Created By:** protectnewmexico@gmail.com

**Recipients:**

**Post Office:** gmail.com

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	634	7/31/2018 2:22:39 AM
NRC-2018-0052_NISG-38.pdf	3924407	
ATT00001.htm	496	

**Options**  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Return Notification:** No  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Sensitivity:** Normal  
**Expiration Date:**  
**Recipients Received:**

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature

*Lisa Houston*

Date

*7/21/18*

Name (Print)

*Lisa Houston*

City & State

*Albuquerque, NM*



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.


**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature  Date 7/21/18

Name (Print) Silas Bussmann

City & State Albuquerque, NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like "collective dose risk" and "person-rem" are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature

Name (Print)

City & State

Date



C. Zubeck  
Alb. Minn.

July 2018

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.



**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature Diana Chavez Date 7-21-18

Name (Print) Diana Chavez

City & State Alb. N. Mex

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like "collective dose risk" and "person-rem" are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date 7-21-2018

Name (Print)

City & State

Albuquerque, NM 87109



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/18

Name (Print)

PATRICK RUIZ

City & State

ALBUQUERQUE, NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

07/21/2018

Name (Print)

Bridgette Crowley

City & State

Albuquerque, NM



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/18

Name (Print)

KIPP ROSKON

City & State

Olympia, Washington

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/18

Name (Print)

Kayla Weise

City & State

Olympia, WA



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

8/21/18

Name (Print)

Berleen Felipe

City & State

Albuquerque, NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/18

Name (Print)

Jeremy Felipe

City & State

Albuquerque, NM



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7-21-18

Name (Print)

Clint Peto

City & State

Rio Rancho, NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/18

Name (Print)

Natalia C. Thomas

City & State

Albuquerque, NM



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like "collective dose risk" and "person-rem" are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature Abayd Al Shammari Date July 21, 2018

Name (Print) \_\_\_\_\_

City & State Albuquerque, NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/18

Name (Print)

Isabella Herrera

City & State

Albuquerque, NM



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like "collective dose risk" and "person-rem" are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.


**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature  Date 7/21/18

Name (Print) Anthony Novot

City & State Albuquerque, NM 87106

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature

*Vennie Eline White*

Date

*7/21/2018*

Name (Print)

*Vennie Eline White*

City & State

*ABQ, NM 87106*



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature

Yvonne Gonzales Date 7/21/18

Name (Print)

Yvonne Gonzales

City & State

Alb. NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/17

Name (Print)

Cameron Mozafari

City & State

~~Albuquerque, NM~~ Albuquerque, NM



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.



**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/18

Name (Print)

YARROW ALLAIRE

City & State

ALBUQUERQUE, NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/18

Name (Print)

UAHEKA MAILE

City & State

ABQ, HI

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.



### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature Lawrence M. Frost Date 07-21-18

Name (Print) Lawrence M Frost

City & State ABQ, NM 87102



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature

Name (Print)

City & State



John Courtney

Socorro, NM

Date

7/21/18

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature

*Patrice Fusano*

Date

*7/21/18*

Name (Print)

*Patrice Fusano*

City & State

*Albuquerque, NM 87106*



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.



**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature  Date 21 July 2018

Name (Print) Mark Kramer

City & State Albuquerque NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/18

Name (Print)

Chloe Aguilar

City & State

Albuquerque, New Mexico

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

July 21 2018

Name (Print)

Emily Hummer

City & State

Albuquerque NM 87120



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/18

Name (Print)

Caitlyn Mayhew

City & State

Albuquerque, NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7-21-18

Name (Print)

JONATHAN SANGER

City & State

ALBUQUERQUE NM



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.



### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature Gabriele Maestas Date 7/21/18

Name (Print) Gabriele Maestas

City & State Albuquerque NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

July 21 2017

Name (Print) Briana Dooler

City & State Abq NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.



**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/18

Name (Print)

CASEY EVANS

City & State

ABQ, NEW MEXICO



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature

Madeline Starkweather Date 7/21/18

Name (Print)

Madeline Starkweather

City & State

Albuquerque, New Mexico

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/2018

Name (Print)

Shoshanna Fernstein

City & State

Albuquerque N.M



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.



### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date 7-21-18

Name (Print)

CHE HECK

City & State

ALBUQUERQUE NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/18

Name (Print)

Virginia Hillard

City & State

Santa Fe, CA

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

1/21/18

Name (Print)

Annette Daw

City & State

Albuquerque, NM



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature David Tanorio Date 07/21/18

Name (Print) David Tanorio

City & State San Felipe pue. New Mexico 87001

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7.21.18

Name (Print)

Tara Benaude

City & State

Santo Domingo Pueblo, NM 87052



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.



### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

You must be kidding if you think  
we're going to tolerate this!  
Have a nice day ☺

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/18

Name (Print)

Victoria Love

City & State

Albuquerque, NM 87105

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature

*Serena Dowling*

Date

*7/21/18*

Name (Print)

*Serena Dowling*

City & State

*Anchorage, AK*

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.



### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/18

Name (Print)

TIFFANY CURTIS

City & State

ALBUQUERQUE, NM



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/18

Name (Print)

RICHARD CABEZA DE GUZMAN

City & State

ABQ, NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature Marcy Hostetter Date 07/21/18

Name (Print) Alancy Hostetter

City & State Albuquerque, NM



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.



**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature

Name (Print)

City & State



Date

7-21-18

M. J. Zimmerman

Albuquerque, NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature  Date 7-21-18

Name (Print) ERIC PARTHUM

City & State ALBUQUERQUE, NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.



**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like "collective dose risk" and "person-rem" are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7-21-18

Name (Print)

Anna Claire Besedick

City & State

ABQ NM



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature

 Date 7-21-18

Name (Print)

Jessica Ribreau

City & State

Albuquerque NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

July 20, 2018

Name (Print)

Lucie Wang

City & State

Albuquerque NM



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.



**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature

*Daniel Laws*

Date

*JULY 21, 2018*

Name (Print)

*DANIEL LAWS*

City & State

*ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. 87102*

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

### **The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

### **Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

### **More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

### **Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

### **Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

### **A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7-21-18

Name (Print)

FRED A. Reede

City & State

Albu. N.M.

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.



**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

July 21, 2018

Name (Print)

Brandi L. Ahmle

City & State

Laguna, New Mexico



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions In The Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes And Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines And Other Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines, surface and subsurface projects must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases Of The Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included In The EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7-21-18

Name (Print)

J. Oesterling

City & State

Albany NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

#### **This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

#### **Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

#### **The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

#### **More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

#### **All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/18

Name (Print)

MONICA KENNEDY

City & State

ABQ, NEW MEXICO



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.



**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like "collective dose risk" and "person-rem" are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/2018

Name (Print)

Rosa Oglesby

City & State

Albuquerque NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature

Date

7/21

Name (Print)

Tatiana Ascaro

City & State

Abq NM

May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like “collective dose risk” and “person-rem” are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**


- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature



Date

7/21/18

Name (Print)

Celby Seal

City & State

Houston, Tx.



May Ma  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: TWFN-7- A60M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555- 0001

RE: Docket ID NRC-2018-0052; Holtec International's HI-STORE Spent Fuel Waste Facility

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am extremely concerned about the Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) facility proposed by Holtec International to store up to 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste in southeast New Mexico. I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposal itself and the scope of the Environmental Review and analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I am submitting these comments because I do not consent to New Mexico becoming a national dumping ground for "spent fuel" from every nuclear reactor in the country. I do not consent to transporting up to 10,000 canisters of highly radioactive waste through communities nationwide. I do not consent to the risk of contamination of our lands, aquifers, air, or the health of our people, plants, wildlife, and livestock. I do not consent to endangering present and future generations.

I formally request additional Public Scoping Meetings for other communities throughout the United States (U.S.) that will be impacted by the transport of these waste canisters.

**This Holtec Proposal Is Contrary To Current Law**

- Current law only allows the U.S. Department of Energy to take title to commercial spent fuel "following commencement of operation of a repository" or at a DOE-owned and operated monitored retrievable storage facility. The Holtec site meets neither requirement, as it is a private facility.

**Holtec Must Remove Copyrights And All Redactions in the Environmental Report (ER)**

- NRC must require Holtec to produce an ER that has no such copyright restrictions and has no redactions. It is impossible to make recommendations on the scope of analyses of these redacted areas of the ER for the EIS.

**The Impacts Of Permanent Storage Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER is incomplete because it does not analyze the impacts of the spent fuel being left at the Holtec site indefinitely. The EIS needs to include an analysis of the impacts of permanent storage should the CIS facility become a de facto permanent waste site.

**More Alternatives Must Be Analyzed**

- The high-level radioactive waste is too dangerous to move and can remain on site for many more years. It should not be moved until all alternatives are analyzed, including keeping the waste where it is in some form of Hardened On Site Storage (HOSS) on the reactor sites or at suitable locations as close to the reactors as possible to minimize transport risks.
- The alternative of consolidated storage at an existing licensed Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility (ISFSI) must also be analyzed.

**All Transportation Routes and Risks Must Be Analyzed**

- The EIS must include all possible transportation routes and study the potential impacts from accidents, terrorism incidents, and how new rail lines or roads for waste shipments will impact public health, environment, water sources, flora, fauna (especially any endangered species), and occupational safety along these routes.

**The Consequences To An Accident-Exposed Individual Must Be Analyzed**

- Terms like "collective dose risk" and "person-rem" are used to ignore the potential impacts to a single individual.
- All possible human exposures from routine and accidental radioactive releases during transport and at the site must be clearly defined in plain language, for individuals near waste on occasion and workers who are transporting or working at the CIS site long-term.

**Cracked And Leaking Canisters Must Be Addressed**

- The ER does not analyze exactly how radioactive waste from a cracked and leaking canister would be handled, since there is no wet pool or hot cell at the site. The EIS must include how cracked and leaking canisters will be handled onsite and during transport and analyze possible environmental impacts if leaks or spills occur from cracked canisters.

**More Cumulative Impacts Must Be Analyzed**

- The ER mentions the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) but does not analyze the impacts of a radiologic release from WIPP on the proposed CIS site.
- The impacts from WIPP and possible impacts from and to the local oil and gas industries need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Seismic Impacts On Stored Casks Must Be Stated**

- Although the ER gives a statement on recent seismic activity in the area, there is no analysis of what fracking-induced earthquakes will have on the buried casks. These impacts need to be analyzed and included in the EIS.

**Future Electrical Transmission Lines and Plumbing Infrastructure Must Be Analyzed**

- Impacts from new electrical lines and plumbing must be included in EIS.

**Economic Impacts Must Be Analyzed For The Different Phases of the Project**

- The economic impacts must be studied and clearly state any positive or negative impacts from this site: initially, after construction is complete, and throughout the whole 120 years.
- How many jobs will be created? How many are only temporary and how many are permanent? How many will go to local residents?

**A Thorough Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis Must Be Included in the EIS**

- Impacts to EJ communities near the site and along transport routes must be studied, including but not limited to economic and health impacts that are specific to lower income and people of color communities. For indigenous populations located near the site or along transport routes, this EJ analysis must include impacts to culturally important natural resources, such as: sacred places, traditional food sources, and traditional medical plants.

Sincerely,

Signature Lizbeth Mischler Date July 21, 2013

Name (Print) Lizbeth Mischler

City & State Albuquerque, New Mexico

