

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

SUNSI Review
Complete
Template = ADM-013
E-RIDS=ADM-03
ADD: Marlayna Doell,
Mary Neely

COMMENT (1766)
PUBLICATION
DATE: 3/6/2020
CITATION 85 FR
13076

As of: 1/29/21 9:21 AM
Received: September 12, 2020
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No. 1k4-9ixf-gllz
Comments Due: October 21, 2020
Submission Type: Web

Docket: NRC-2020-0065

Transfer of Very Low-Level Waste to Exempt Persons for Disposal

Comment On: NRC-2020-0065-0001

Transfer of Very Low-Level Waste to Exempt Persons for Disposal

Document: NRC-2020-0065-DRAFT-1774

Comment on FR Doc # 2020-04506

Submitter Information

Name: Cass Martinez

General Comment

This change seems tailor-made for Waste Management, the company that operates the landfill at Arlington, Oregon. But that landfill is too close to the Columbia River. Many communities draw their drinking water downstream. Mine does, and I know we don't need any more nuclear waste in that river. I oppose the VLLW plan to reinterpret the rules to let nuclear waste go to places it shouldn't.

Sending it to hazardous or industrial waste sites is even worse because the radioactivity can react with other chemicals, making leaks to air and water exponentially more harmful than they are already. I oppose the exemption from nuclear regulatory control that could lead to the nuclear waste getting burned or recycled into everyday items and building supplies.

This VLLW proposal could permit, by exemption, entire massive nuclear reactors being dumped or left as if not radioactive.

NRC is claiming this reinterpretation is "voluntary." How will we ever know which landfills and which states are doing it? The whole proposal is a secretive deregulation without public notice or opportunity for individuals or communities to intervene when their landfill or other facility is applying or approved as "specific exempt." Once approved, it would be forever allowed to take that kind of nuclear waste with no enforcement of the very vague assumptions.

The proposed "dose limit"--really ANY dose limit--is a calculation done by applicant using unverified assumptions to claim the site will be acceptable. It is nothing but a blank check to allow unlimited amounts of nuclear waste out of regulatory control with no need to check or enforce radioactive leakage.

This proposal is even more bold and expansive than the many past efforts by the nuclear industry and its

"regulators" which Congress revoked in the 1992 and the public has repeatedly rejected over the decades of the nuclear age.

Scrap this "interpretive" rule change. Keep nuclear waste under nuclear regulatory control and make the polluters pay to try to isolate it--not release it!

Thank you,